

unable at any time to perform the duties of his office, the Governor in Council may appoint a temporary substitute member upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council prescribes.

Mr. BELL: This is another case where the explanations do not seem to justify the change. I wonder about it here when you say that due to wartime conditions it was necessary to have powers such as are asked for here, I ask if it is necessary now. In section 2, subsection 1 and section 3 of the Act, it is suggested because of "temporary delegation to other duties by the governor in council, . . ." I ask why, if this power was necessary in wartime, it is not mentioned in wartime? Is it planned to use it other than in wartime, and if so, why?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspé*): Mr. Chairman, as explained in the explanatory notes of the bill, this is to cover the case when a board member is delegated to some other duty. Before that a substitute could be appointed under the War Measures Act. It was just done in one case, only in one case. Now that the War Measures Act is going out of existence we want the governor in council to be able to appoint a temporary substitute member and that is all.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

Carried.

Shall clause 3 carry?

3. The said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after section 4 thereof, the following section:

Mr. WINCH: I was interested in this section when it came up before the House and I would like to say a few words about it. I can very definitely understand the desire of the board and the department to give certain powers for policing on their own property and with effect to any property that comes under their jurisdiction or administration. I cannot understand why a law enforcement officer of the board who has been brought within the meaning of the Criminal Code as regards a police officer should have that same jurisdiction up to 50 miles away from the board property. Now that means—although as I have heard several times that the waterfront under the jurisdiction of the board in Montreal is some 30 miles—they are covered under this Act not only within the 30 miles, but it would mean they would have the same jurisdiction as a police officer 50 miles beyond the actual property. I have made several inquiries of lawyers amongst the members, and they all agree that is the interpretation of the wording of this section. That is, 50 miles beyond the property limits of the board. I cannot under any consideration see the necessity of granting that much authority for that distance and I would like to suggest for the consideration of the committee an amendment by striking out the word 50 and inserting the word 5, or perhaps 10—but in order to make a suggestion I suggest 5 miles instead of 50 for the purposes of discussion—and if I could have a seconder I will so move.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspé*): Could I give you a short word of explanation? This 50 mile limit was put into the amending clause in order to cover a case like the one in Montreal where the board's property extends for 30 miles, and to cover the specific case which we had recently in Montreal, I think, where some goods were stolen from the board's property and were taken some 30 miles away from the property and hidden there. Before we could get the wheels in motion to go and search the property for the goods, the goods were gone. We also have this other example which I gave in the House the other day when speaking on the second reading. We have violations of the speed limit on the Jacques Cartier Bridge in Montreal. We have to chase these offenders—these motorists—and we may have to cover several miles before we can catch up with them, particularly if they are travelling at a great speed, otherwise, you see, there is no