

they were sending across to the soldiers. Under this law the Sunday school teachers who gave that innocent entertainment are subject to prosecution, and every person who took a hand in it may be imprisoned for three months in the county jail or may have to pay a fine not exceeding \$500. It seems to me that we are putting a ponderous piece of machinery in motion to meet evils that are largely imaginary as far as I know, having regard to the province from which I come. I have not heard a murmur anywhere about the misapplication of any funds that were collected. I submit that this is introducing a new element that is capable of abuse. It will retard the holding of these useful entertainments and discourage the very proper efforts that are being put forth. You might frighten people by telling them that after this Act is passed, if they do anything of this kind, they are subject to prosecution. It is useless to say: They may start to prosecute you, but the Secretary of State can stop it. I think this is absolutely a work of supererogation, and that it is applying criminal legislation where there is no necessity for it and applying it in a dangerous way, the far-reaching effect of which has not been properly comprehended.

Mr. GLASS: I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that because the Criminal Code provides for the punishment of individuals who may defraud the public in this way, the Criminal Code can be entirely relied upon to meet the needs of every case that may arise. An organization may be promulgated to collect a certain fund for a purpose which might come under this Act. The collections might spread over considerable time. While the Criminal Code provides that punishment may be meted out to those who are responsible for a fraud, it certainly is a deterrent to voluntary charity to know that the law will permit such fraud to be perpetrated before it can be dealt with. We have discussed this Bill all afternoon, and I take it from the statements which have appeared in the press and otherwise that the general consensus of opinion is that it is desirable. We have had from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) the opinion that under clause 2, churches may be exempt. I cannot see why it is necessary in so much legislation to adopt the cross-eyed method of not saying what you mean or meaning what you say. If the minister thinks that churches are exempt under this, why not remove the ambiguity and make it clear?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. GLASS: The minister does not think the Bill perfect. It comes from the Senate and from the discussion this afternoon it is evident that we are not all of the opinion that it is as it should be. In its present form it will be cumbersome and troublesome to the great church organizations of this country. I respectfully ask the minister why, if churches are not to be included, an exception in their case should not be inserted in subsection (b), perhaps by adding "excepting churches or church organizations." I presume that a church organization would cover the Salvation Army. Would that not meet many of the objections? The churches should not have to apply to the Secretary of State, and the minister should exempt the churches and such comprehensive organizations throughout Canada. Why can we not put that exemption right in the Bill, and so fix it once for all and avoid any ambiguity or doubt?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no objection to doing it. My own view is that the Bill does not apply to churches, for the reason I mentioned, but if there is any doubt the matter could be dealt with by inserting the words "other than churches" after the word "association." But just as soon as you begin to limit you raise difficulties. That is almost a maxim of drafting. I would suggest that section 2 be allowed to stand.

Mr. McKENZIE: I object to this. No doubt the minister is preparing for closure.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, I am not; not on this Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: I object to allowing any basis for closure, and I think this section should be disposed of.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This motion to stand is a very dangerous motion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall consider whether it is necessary to make an amendment to exclude churches, which I think is the intention of the measure.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was going to suggest that the words "war contribution" should be used instead of "war charity," and that subsection (b) of section 2 should be amended by substituting "contribution" for "charity" in the 11th line, and that the 17th line should be amended by striking out the word "charitable" so as to give jurisdiction over associations formed for