

clauses. The inspector might expect a gas company to extend their mains an unreasonable distance.

HON. MR. POWER—The Acts that we put on our Statute-books in connection with the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue, if they were passed in Russia, and were published broadcast in this country, would be looked upon as measures that could only become law under a despotism. The rights of the citizen are of no account whatever.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend must see that where citizens themselves pass the laws, as they do here, there can be no complaint of despotism, and if the laws are made severe, it is because the public health is at stake.

THE SPEAKER—I am afraid that some of the restrictions contained in the first clause would be difficult to apply to gas supplied from a natural well.

The clause was agreed to.

On section, 3—

HON. MR. ABBOTT—This section will have to be amended. The clause as it stands imposes a penalty on every undertaker furnishing gas for illuminating purposes which exhibits traces of sulphuretted hydrogen. The second portion of the same clause provides a penalty for every undertaker who furnishes gas for illuminating purposes which exhibits ammonia, or sulphur in other forms than sulphuretted hydrogen. In this latter case there is no distinction in the penalty imposed as to the number of customers and the quantity of gas furnished. The penalty is made \$10 a day for each day during which the manufacturer or producer furnishes impure gas, without making any distinction similar to that in the first clause as to the magnitude of the offence. It is proposed to make the same scale of fines in the case of gas tainted with sulphur or ammonia as in the former case, where it is tainted with sulphuretted hydrogen. The presence of these elements in the gas is only a matter of inconvenience. The gas so tainted is not absolutely poisonous, and the penalty need not be so severe, and I propose to amend the latter part of the clause by providing as follows:

“Page 1, line 40.—Leave out from ‘incur’ to ‘for’ in page 2, line 1, and insert ‘Penalties, as

follows: for the first offence, if such undertaker has more than eight thousand customers, thirty dollars; if less than eight thousand and more than four thousand, fifteen dollars; if less than four thousand and more than one thousand, ten dollars; and if one thousand or under, five dollars.”

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Is not the amount of sulphur permitted regulated by the Minister of Inland Revenue?

HON. MR. CLEMON—Yes.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Is ammonia found in our coal?

HON. MR. CLEMON—Yes.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—A fine of \$10 or \$15 would be a mere bagatelle. A gas company in a large town supplying gas would not mind it. It would be simply a matter of calculation whether it would be better to supply a lower scale of illuminating power and pay a fine every time they were found out, deliberately doing it, as a matter of economy. I think that the scale of penalties in the last part of the clause should be quite as high as the scale in the first part of the clause.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Sulphuretted hydrogen is more poisonous than ammonia or sulphur, and therefore there should be a heavier penalty for it.

HON. MR. CLEMON—Sulphur and ammonia are not poisonous. So far as illuminating power is concerned, it is almost impossible, when the mercury goes below 30 degrees, to keep the gas up to standard quality.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—It might be a matter of economy for a company to supply gas of lower illuminating power, and pay the penalty, as compared with the increased cost of supplying pure gas.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—As to the ability to keep sulphuric vapors out of the gas produced from the coal that is used here, I have to say that I built a gas-house in St. Joseph, Missouri, where the coal that is used has ten times the amount of sulphur in it that the coal has here, but they washed the sulphur out of the gas. The reason why the gas is not better here is simply because the company do not take the trouble to wash out the sulphur.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I think there is a good deal of point in the objection taken by the hon. gentleman from Kennebec.