

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But five years' imprisonment for simple neglect on the part of an officer having knowledge in some way of a misdemeanour on the part of another officer in the service in which he is employed to report such offence looks rather severe.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The judge would use his discretion.

Mr. BENNETT: He may impose one day. I will tell you what it is done for. The real truth is that in many instances a man says, where there has been a violation of the law: I am not going to report on what I see under my eyes. But when he is told that he has no option but to do it, and that for failure to do it he incurs the possibility of a term of imprisonment, that being one of the terms of his engagement, I think the effect of it is useful. That is as far as I can go. The main part of this has been on the statute book during all these years.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have no fault to find with the five years' imprisonment where the individual admits his own personal violation of the provisions of the statute, but to impose the same penalty on one simply having knowledge which may be acquired in a manner which gives him no certainty about it, and who fails to report the circumstances, seems rather drastic.

Section agreed to.

Sections 67 and 68 agreed to.

On section 69—Other remedies of His Majesty not impaired.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What is the effect of the change?

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend will remember the class of cases where it has been held that if recourse is had to the remedy as prescribed in the statute that excludes the operation of any other remedy. This simply provides that no criminal or civil remedy shall be lost by reason of action being taken under the provisions of these sections.

Section agreed to.

Section 70 to 72 inclusive agreed to.

On section 73—Venue of actions and prosecutions.

Mr. BENNETT: I would direct the attention of the committee to the fact that it has been found in practice that the limitation of time to six months sometimes works a hardship. Notice must, under this section, be

given at least one month before the commencement of the action. Sometimes complaints have been made that it works a hardship, and I felt bound to direct the attention of the committee to the fact. I have no views to express either one way or the other. In practice I once considered that six months' limitation with one months' notice was—

Mr. RALSTON: When my right hon. friend was on the other side of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: In my time I have been on both sides. In the particular instance I have in mind I was not acting for the crown, but I remember that I was able to use this section. Apparently for the moment the opposing counsel had not thought of it. Some difficulty arises when you say that six months is the period of limitation and that one month's notice has to be given. It therefore follows that for all practical purposes one does not have much more than five months. However at this time I merely direct the attention of the committee to the fact.

Section agreed to.

Section 74 agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: In these sections it will be observed that three months is the limit of time within which any one might be employed for these purposes.

Section 75 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TARIFF BOARD

PROVISION FOR APPOINTMENT, POWERS, DUTIES AND SALARIES

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 47, to provide for the appointment of a tariff board.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Section 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Constitution of board.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to refer to subsections 3, 4 and 5 of section 3, in connection with which there was full discussion on the second reading of the bill. The view taken at that time by speakers on this side of the house was that tenure of office should not be for a period of ten years, but that office should be held during pleasure. I do not know that at this time we can add much to what has been