

personally knowledgeable that he was doing this thing intentionally and cheating the people, I can see why he was not severely dealt with.

About collecting the money, again it seems to be in accordance with other ministerial departments to say, "well, is this a case where we should go beyond the offence on the face of it, and collect the money back from the doctor or not"? Somebody made a decision, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN: There is one difference, Mr. Bigg. In your case the amount was \$192 and this is over \$4000.

Mr. BIGG: That is right but there were four doctors in this particular case and none of them, to my knowledge, handled the accounts, the payment of money at any time. The girls do it behind the desk and deposit my cheque or my cash to his account in the bank. It certainly is quite possible that he did not know that this was going on to the extent that it was. There must be some reason for the laxity.

Mr. LONG: Mr. Bigg, this was a service doctor who was in receipt of a salary from the Crown. Therefore, any money he collected should have been revenue—

Mr. BIGG: He was not running any other private practice?

Mr. LONG: I do not think so.

Mr. HENDERSON: He was on the payroll.

Mr. BIGG: Yes, I know.

Mr. BALDWIN: What you are saying is, it is a fact that no action was taken and this lack of action might have originated because of the laxity in failing to see that this practice continued for a period of two years and this service officer was allowed to carry on a practice which permitted him to retain this \$4,000? They, very likely, may be the same people who failed to initiate the action that might have resulted in the money being returned to where it belongs before the officer left the service. This is what I think is important.

Mr. BIGG: Where doctors are on stations, like Cold Lake Airport, in the Air Force, I do not believe they are prevented from practicing their profession when they are not, shall we say, required at the station. I believe there are not only army personnel and air force personnel at that station, but there are as many civilians, as, and in some cases more than there are service personnel. It is my understanding these men are allowed to practice their profession as long as they do their duty in the Air Force. I am just saying, let us not be too hasty and say this man is a confirmed criminal when he may be carrying on a doctoring practice. Carelessness in bookkeeping is not necessarily criminal in intent.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee like to have the official to explain some of these questions?

Mr. FLEMMING: Do I understand that this was settled for \$2500, or is that—

Mr. HENDERSON: That is correct. It has been settled for \$2500. He engaged a lawyer and that settlement was made by the Department of Justice.

Mr. FLEMMING: That is what I wanted to clear up.