

mendous job, and you make him swear to the correctness of every detail. This is very expensive. In the Bill as it stood the commissioner could go into an office and seize the books, take them into his own custody and padlock them; after he has the books, if they are applied for, he is at liberty to say, "I am sorry you cannot get your books. You can make a copy." Imagine being told that you can make a copy of books of entry, the copying of which would take I do not know how long. I have known of books being tied up for a whole summer, even after the investigation was over and the report had been made. The whole business is utterly paralyzed. But when we want a man to give evidence we give him \$1.25 a day.

These features are laughable, but they are aside, perhaps from the things I am trying to drive in. Let us try to have as much judicial review of extraordinary functions as we can. That done and I will agree to the proposal.

Now, as to section 22, about the documents being used in evidence in any subsequent proceedings. I have not changed my mind one whit, and from what I have heard from Mr. O'Connor, he is of the same view in regard to it. In fact, I knew he was. I have read all that has been said the other way, but, as I said yesterday, if we can come to an agreement by yielding a point, I am ready to yield it, so there is no use arguing it further. But I do think that if it is to be done, and documents are to be made usable in subsequent proceedings, they should be used only to the extent needed by this Act—that is to say, in any subsequent proceeding for the violation of this Act. We are surely not going to legislate to say that notwithstanding the law they can be used for some criminal proceeding that has nothing to do with this Act at all. With that qualification I will stand by what I said and be prepared to yield the point.

I do not think there is anything else of consequence. I followed the reading as well as I could, and if the principles I sought to bring out are embodied in this I will agree to it. I am certainly pleased to see the leader of the Government take the position he does. We never could have done justice to the Bill as it was, even if we sat a week. I feel, indeed, quite incompetent to satisfy myself that this is o.k., because I have not read a vast amount of the criticism that has been made of this measure. Nevertheless, we have this situation—that however bad things are we have had them before; and if we see to it that these precautions which seem to me to be sound sense are looked after, I am ready to accept the Government's proposal. I know that some honourable gentlemen are not of that view, but I have expressed my own view.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the committee like to have time to consider the new Bill?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It is not so much a new Bill—

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an amendment to the Bill, and the work seems to have been well done.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Bill effects, I think, what I have tried to state.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It does.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We are transferring the administration to the Minister of Labour, to the commissioner to be appointed, and making consequential amendments of the clause as to the admissibility of evidence.

I can see fairly well the view expressed by Senator Meighen, but I do not see, under the Act of 1935, of which this document is but an amendment—and I do not think Senator Meighen sees it clearly himself—the concrete form of the amendment he would propose.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: My idea is this: to have some provision for the fiat of a judge or, if not a judge, of the Tariff Commissioner who had it in hand before, and who could not possibly have operated because the Bill has been before the Privy Council and only came out of their hands a few weeks ago—to have a fiat for the investigation and for the infliction of any punishments that now may be in the hands of the commissioner, or any extraordinary action such