

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, after all, sir, before a person can set forth his amendment he has to set forth the circumstances making it necessary. We are not in the same position as the government, who can hand their friends a dish of crow and say, "Take it or leave it". We have to advance reasons why there should be a change in the law. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John-Albert:

That paragraphs (d) and (e) of section 36, subsection 1, be deleted.

In consequence there would be a renumbering of the subsequent paragraphs.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know whether any other hon. member cares to speak to the amendment. If so, it may save time if I wait until all hon. members who wish to discuss it have spoken.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. gentleman who moved this amendment told the committee frankly that he did not understand the section. I think he took a little more time than was necessary to prove that. I was interested in the discussion which took place arising out of some of his remarks, reference having been made to a certain bill with similar clauses which was passed by a previous parliament.

Mr. FULTON: They were not similar at all.

Mr. IRVINE: I am glad to say I supported that bill, and some of the strongest artillery on the side of the present government opposed it. To my mind that was one of the best pieces of legislation ever put on the statute books of Canada. Here we have one of the best pieces of legislation which this government has ever brought forward, and it is being opposed by the heaviest artillery on the other side. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to realize that I have been right both times.

Mr. HAZEN: In rising to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lake Centre I feel there is little I can add to the statements he has made. He has gone thoroughly into the matter and has pointed out very clearly the reasons why these clauses should be removed from section 35 of the bill. The day before yesterday, when section 23 of the bill was before the committee, I pointed out that a business man would be precluded from paying or handing money to a tourist. The minister said in reply that this was correct, but he added that it was or would be covered by regulations. His statement and mine will

be found on *Hansard* at page 4452. I read the section of the bill and I said:

In view of that part of the section which I have read, and that definition, is not a business man in this country precluded from paying money or handing any money to a tourist who comes in here? As I read the section, that is one of its effects.

The minister said: "Theoretically my hon. friend is correct." I take it from that statement that he meant I am right.

Mr. ABBOTT: It is covered by the regulation, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. HAZEN: The minister continued:

That, of course, is covered by regulation. That is an obvious case in which there should be the general rule, and payments to tourists are accepted from that general provision.

I was surprised by that answer. As I understand it, what it means is that when the members of this house have passed a law which has a clear meaning, the board can change the law by regulation.

Surely things are coming to a strange pass in this country when a thing like that can happen. I recall reading some time ago—I have since looked it up—Lewis Carroll's classic. When Alice took exception to Humpty Dumpty defining the word "glory" as meaning "a nice knock-down argument," Humpty Dumpty replied in rather scornful tones, "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less". But "the question is whether you can make words mean so many different things," Alice objected; and Humpty Dumpty replied, "The question is, which is to be the master—that is all."

The question here, it seems to me, is, who is to be master? Are members of parliament to be master, or is the board?

An hon. MEMBER: Surely.

Mr. HAZEN: An hon. gentleman suggests that members of the House of Commons are to be the master, and so they should. But under this section the board by regulation can change the laws that we make here. Let me refer to the section again. Section 35 makes the board the master. It is provided that the board may make regulations, and when we turn to paragraph (e), taking the two together, we read:

The board may make regulations notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained elsewhere in this act, exempting any person or any class of persons . . . from any provision of this act.

Surely that is going altogether too far. This is the first time, as the member for Lake Centre pointed out, that parliament has been