## FREE FOREIGN TRADE ZONES BILL

## SECOND READING

Hon. J. P. B. CASGRAIN moved the second reading of Bill A, an Act to enable the establishment, operation and maintenance of Free Foreign Trade Zones.

He said: Honourable members, I am sure that you will pardon me if I do not repeat the rather lengthly remarks that I made when this Bill came up for second reading last session. There is absolutely nothing new that I can say. The Bill is exactly the same as the Bill of last year. Honourable members will recall that that Bill was referred to a special committee which sat for some three weeks, on and off, got all the information available, and reported the Bill back to the Senate. The report was adopted, and the Bill was passed, but it reached the House of Commons just the day before prorogation and there was not sufficient time to give it proper consideration there. I therefore crave the indulgence of the Senate in asking to have the Bill read a second time now, so that it can be sent to the other House, to be dealt with as is deemed fit.

I move the second reading of the Bill, seconded by Hon. Mr. Rainville.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the motion is carried, I wish to say on behalf of the honourable senator who has been named as the seconder (Hon. Mr. Rainville) that he desired the second reading carried over till Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I was going to suggest that he could hardly be accepted as seconder during his absence.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He was just designated in that way.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: In making his motion my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Casgrain) said that it was seconded by Senator Rainville.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: He asked me to have it seconded in his name. He had to be away to-day to attend to a very important financial transaction. He is just as anxious as I am to see the Bill go to the other House.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sure it is the desire of the honourable senator (Hon. Mr. Rainville) to speak on the Bill. He can do that if the third reading goes over until Tuesday.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

## WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

On motion of Hon. Mr. Dandurand, the Senate went into Committee on Bill 4, an Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Hon. Mr. Coté in the Chair.

On section 1—recovery of penalties:

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I move the suggested amendment, which was referred to yesterday. It is as follows:

Strike out all the words following "two" in the twelfth line to the end of the Bill and substitute the following: "such justices or before any person who is authorized by section 604 of the Criminal Code to exercise in such district, county or place the powers of two or more justices."

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is the suggested amendment which I mentioned yesterday.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The amendment would undoubtedly improve the phraseology of the section. Our Parliamentary Counsel takes the view that the whole Bill is unnecessary, but that it does no harm. The law will be just the same after this measure is passed.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if it is the purpose of the Bill to give exclusive jurisdiction to a justice of the peace with respect to the first class of offences mentioned?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Oh, no.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It makes clear that when the penalty exceeds \$50 a justice of the peace, or two justices of the peace, or a police magistrate, a stipendiary magistrate, or any person having the power or authority of two or more justices of the peace, will have jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: That is true. But the first part of the section says:

if the penalty does not exceed fifty dollars by summary conviction before any justice of the peace for the district, county or place in which the offence is committed.

That is, as I read the Bill, only a justice of the peace would have jurisdiction in that class of cases in which the penalty does not exceed \$50. In the second class of cases, where the penalty exceeds \$50, the section enumerates different justices or magistrates who would have jurisdiction. To my mind