

My suggestion was that the words "court of record" should be changed to "court of competent jurisdiction." The tariff board is a court of record, but we would hardly expect such process to issue out of that board. There are so many courts of record that I think this subsection should be restricted in some way.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): There is no objection to that. I move that the words "of record" in subsection 4, of section 16 be struck out and replaced by the words "of competent jurisdiction."

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Marine): With the unanimous consent of the house, I would move that the bill be now read a third time. The other chamber is anxious to receive this bill.

Mr. R. E. FINN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, before this motion carries I should like to say that because of illness I was unable to be in the house when this bill was last being considered. I got out of a sick bed to come to the house the other afternoon when the bill was to be considered and I was informed on arrival that it was going to stand over for a fortnight. Only late this afternoon I learned that it was to come up to-night. The other day the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie) moved an amendment which I read in Hansard, and my hon. colleague, who is not in the house—

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, he is here.

Mr. ISNOR: Yes, I am here.

Mr. FINN: Well, all I can say is that two minds think alike. I can see that my right hon. friend is pleased that my colleague is here, and I am also pleased, but I would say to my hon. colleague that I had no knowledge that he was going away. So far as I am concerned it is immaterial to me whether he goes or stays.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman's remarks are relevant.

Mr. FINN: Of course, one may digress for a moment, but what I was going to say was that my colleague moved or suggested an amendment the other afternoon. It was the afternoon I came into the house in order that I might have an opportunity if necessary to support him in that amendment. But as I had already pointed out on a previous

occasion, the amendment he then proposed would possibly conflict with sections that were already in the transcontinental act, and it might be well therefore not to proceed with it. I had not had, nor have I had an opportunity to consult with him or to discuss with him the subject matter of that amendment; all I know is that it was unceremoniously rejected. My colleague and I represent a constituency which is affected by this bill now before the house, for Halifax is one of the great eastern gateways of Canada. We should, therefore, be negligent in our duty if we did not see to it that the interests of these ports are protected with respect to the movement of traffic over Canadian territory and over Canadian lines to Canadian ports.

As regards the amendment that was moved by the Minister of National Defence, I read it in Hansard; in fact, I am under the impression that there were two. I am not quite sure just what was meant by these amendments, or whether they were in substitution for the amendment proposed by my colleague from Halifax, or whether they dealt with the same subject matter. The amendment which my colleague proposed was offered for the purpose of clarity and to protect the interests of our eastern ports, as I believe the Minister of National Defence would wish to see them protected, as well as the western ports of this great dominion. Before the motion for a third reading is put, I should like, with the permission of the chair, to ask the Minister of National Defence what was the purport and meaning of the amendments that were submitted by him to the committee.

Mr. W. A. WALSH (Mount Royal): When this measure was first introduced, if I remember correctly, I commended the Minister of Marine (Mr. Howe), though the commendation was to some extent qualified. It is not my intention at this time to make a speech on the bill, but before the bill finally passed the house I wanted to crystallize a few thoughts that were in my mind.

There is one point I wanted to emphasize and it is this: I can read in this measure a certain degree of assurance that the new commission which is to be appointed is to be a body of civil servants or a body created from members of the present civil service. I do not think that is a commendable action as far as the government is concerned, and I want to voice my opinion against that action. I also wanted to take exception to section 3 whereby these members are to be appointed by the governor in council and shall hold