

has been held by a single judge in Ontario. The cases are given on the right-hand page. This is to make it clear that the magistrate has power to suspend.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: He is a court.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section 20 was agreed to.

On section 21—time for commencement of prosecution:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This is to increase from one month to six months the running of the Statute of Limitations in the case of offences by the improper use of offensive weapons under sections 116, and 118 to 124, inclusive.

Section 21 was agreed to.

On section 22—new form added:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This section adds the form which appears on page 10 of the Bill.

Section 22 was agreed to.

On section 23—coming into force:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 23 is the section which calls into force on the first day of September, 1934, all the provisions of this Bill except section 3, which shall come into effect on proclamation by the Governor in Council. Section 3 is the one which makes compulsory the registration of everyone who has in his possession a revolver or a pistol.

Hon. Mr. MacARTHUR: Would the right honourable gentleman tell me if there is any distinction in the Act between pistols and rifles, or between shot and ball and shells, or whether anybody who is in possession of a pistol or a rifle is liable to a fine? The reason I ask is that there are pistols and rifles intended for the shooting of plover and small game, and which do not cause bodily harm.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid I cannot give a very satisfactory answer to that question. The honourable gentleman will find "offensive weapon" defined in the Code. It has to be a weapon that will do harm.

Hon. Mr. MacARTHUR: Bodily harm?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no pistol that cannot do bodily harm.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Except a water pistol.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: There may be rifles that would not cause harm. "Pistol" does not include shot-guns.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Sawed-off shot-guns are included.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: We lack the experience of the honourable gentleman from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach), who last year drew a very fine distinction between revolvers and pistols. I think the weapons referred to must be capable of doing bodily harm.

Section 23 was agreed to.

On section 12—intimidation (reconsidered):

Hon. Mr. COTE: Section 12 contains an amendment to section 501 of the Criminal Code, which deals with intimidation. Undoubtedly it would apply to picketing, which might amount to intimidation. Section 501 provides that everyone is guilty of an offence who does certain things wrongfully and without lawful authority, with a view to compelling any other person to abstain from doing anything which he has a lawful right to do, or to do anything from which he has a lawful right to abstain. There is given a list of acts which may be regarded as intimidation, and this includes paragraph f, which is as follows:

—besets or watches the house or other place where such other person resides or works, or carries on business or happens to be.

That wording is rather broad, and I am told it has been decided by one or two judges that merely calling at a house—not watching it, but merely calling there—might come under paragraph f. This, of course, would be going a little too far, and it is proposed to amend it by adding subsection g.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Has that been adopted in the Commons?

Hon. Mr. COTE: Oh, yes. It reads:

Attending at or near or approaching to such house or other place as aforesaid, in order merely to obtain or communicate information, shall not be deemed a watching or besetting within the meaning of this section.

This reduces the scope of the section in what I think is a very reasonable manner. My own interpretation of the section as it stands in the Act would exclude the mere attending at or near the house—that is, just making one call—to find out who is working there. Under the amendment it is made clear that this is not an offence.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Or any number of calls for that purpose would not be an offence.