

ESTIMATES FOR GEORGIAN BAY CANAL READY.

Three Millions for Back River and French River Sections to be asked.

Special to the Montreal 'Star.'

Ottawa, January 16.—That the government has under consideration, as supplementary estimates, appropriations which really mean the commencement of work upon the Georgian bay canal system was learned to-day.

It is stated that in the supplementaries is likely to be included an item of about \$3,000,000, half of it for deepening the Rivière des Prairies, the Back river at Montreal, and the rest for the French river section of the work.

When questioned about this to-day Hon. William Pugsley observed:

'The whole matter is under advisement. I can make no statement till it is dealt with by the cabinet upon the return of the Minister of Finance.'

Meanwhile it is learned that estimates with that end in view have been prepared and will be dealt with by the cabinet council.

The appropriations which are now proposed are for portions of the work which would be of utility even if the main scheme were not proceeded with, but at the same time they may rightfully be regarded as the beginning of the canal system.

The national character of the undertaking and its great importance as affording an additional outlet for the grain traffic of the west cannot, it is held, be over-estimated. It ranks with the Transcontinental railway as a huge undertaking of far-reaching consequences upon the transportation problem of the country.

Is it the intention of the government to place an estimate of this amount in the supplementary estimates and is it intended to have printed some additional copies of the report which was laid on the table of the House two sessions ago? This report is a very valuable one, and I have had several inquiries for it, but have been unable to procure copies, as it is out of print.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To the first question I could not give any other answer than that already given by the Minister of Public Works yesterday, that the matter is now under consideration. As to the other question, I see no reason why, if it is thought advisable, we should not have another edition of that report.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 47), to amend the immigration Act read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1, Canadian domicile—how acquired.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature and purpose of the change made by this section?

Mr. OLIVER. I will make a little general explanation, that the particular explanation may be better understood. As my

hon. friend knows, last year we passed a new Immigration Act which did not alter the principles contained in the Act of 1906, but was drafted with a view to meet the exigencies arising out of the more strict administration of the Act. That is, the Act of last year was simply a more complete embodiment of the principles that had already been in force. One of the points that we found it very necessary to provide in the Act of last session was as to the rights of domicile acquired by those who were not citizens of Canada by residence in Canada. We went into that very carefully, and thought we had covered the point fairly well. But, since last session, one or two cases arose which brought the matter into question: and the two amendments which are contained in this section now before the committee are intended to meet the lack that, on the test being made, was found to exist in the section of the law as it stands. The section now before the committee is a reprint of the section passed last year with two exceptions, and the words making the change are contained in brackets. (Of course, if the amendments are agreed to, a motion will be made to strike out the brackets.) Except for these two alterations this section is word for word as it was last year. The first alteration is in the first line, and the words: 'can only be' are substituted for the word 'is'. The reason for the change is this: 'A judge held that, while it was perfectly clear under the reading of the Act as I had given it that Canadian domicile could be acquired in the way set out in the Act, he held that it could also be acquired in some other way which was not contemplated by the Act. Therefore, in order to meet that view of the case, we propose this change, the purpose being to restrict domicile in the operation of the Act to the definition we give in the Act. The second amendment is to provide for the case of a person who entered Canada previous to the passing of the Act of last year, but who had not resided in the country for three years. The Act of last session only contemplated that a person acquired domicile by residing in the country for three years. Now, the person who entered the country before the passing of the Act, who had not been three years in the country, under a strict reading of the Act as the judge applied it, was found by him not to have domicile, which, of course, was not the intent. So, this change is made to grant domicile to those who entered Canada before the passing of the Act of last year, but who had not been three years in the country at the time of the passing of the Act. These are the two amendments to the section, and the purpose is as I have stated, and the reason for the amendments is that the question has come up in court and the judge has