

fications. The bill provides for the cancellation of licences but there is no provision for the cancelling of certificates.

Mr. LESAGE: I do not think any power to cancel a certificate has to be mentioned because the right to cancel a certificate is correlative in law to the right to grant it. There is nothing being added to this section; this amendment merely clarifies it. The right to issue a licence includes the right to cancel, suspend or amend it.

Mr. STIRLING: Is there any reason why the words "or any part thereof" could not be included in subsection 8?

Mr. HOWE: My legal adviser does not think they are necessary, but there would be no objection to having them in.

Mr. STIRLING: I think it would be a good thing to have them in.

Mr. HOWE: I will ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs to move that section 9 be amended by adding in line 29 thereof after the word "licence" the words "or any part thereof".

Mr. MACKENZIE: I move accordingly.

Mr. LESAGE: Those words are useless; it is putting in a lot of words for nothing.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is being diplomatic, though.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. COCKERAM: Why should the appeal be to the minister? If I were the minister I think I would always support my subordinates, and I believe that is what the minister would do in this case. I am wondering if the appeal should not be to some judicial body?

Mr. HOWE: There is an appeal to the supreme court on questions of law.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 10—Operating without a licence.

Mr. CASE: This section provides that every person who operates a commercial air service without a valid licence shall be liable upon summary conviction to a fine of five thousand dollars or imprisonment for a term of six months or to both such fine and such imprisonment. The fine seems to be arbitrary.

Mr. HOWE: My hon. friend will appreciate that the five thousand dollars is a maximum

fine. We may be dealing with some rather substantial corporations, and questions may arise where a fine of one thousand dollars would be a minor penalty for a serious infraction.

Mr. HAZEN: If this is the maximum fine, why should the wording not follow that of section 5? Before the words "five thousand dollars" we should have the words "not exceeding". If five thousand dollars is to be the maximum fine, as the minister has said, then I would suggest that the words "not exceeding" be put in before the word "five", to follow section 5.

Mr. HOWE: He may receive a fine or imprisonment or both.

Mr. LESAGE: The college of physicians act in the province of Quebec provides for a fine of \$200 or sixty days in gaol for a third offence, but that has been interpreted by our courts as not being a maximum but a fixed payment because it does not say "not exceeding". I think the words "not exceeding" should be in this section.

Mr. HOWE: I will ask my colleague to move that section 10 be amended by adding in line 38 thereof the words "not exceeding" before the words "five thousand".

Mr. MACKENZIE: I move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LESAGE: Is the same principle not involved in connection with the term of imprisonment?

Mr. HAZEN: I suggest that we follow the wording of section 5.

Mr. HOWE: I agree. I will ask my colleague to move that the section be amended by adding the words "not exceeding" before the words "six months" in line 39.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I move accordingly.

Mr. MacNICOL: Then you will have to go back to section 5 and do the same thing.

Mr. STIRLING: We should follow the wording of section 5 which is, "not to exceed a fine of five thousand dollars or imprisonment for six months."

Mr. LESAGE: The words "not to exceed" cover the fine and imprisonment.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved that section 10 be amended by striking out the word "for" in line 39 and inserting the words "not to exceed" in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.