

mic situation. Without a proper solution of this province, our bountiful harvests and successful industries alike fail to produce their best results.

The measure for the better observance of the Lord's Day is sure to receive serious consideration at the hands of hon. gentlemen, whatever the form of religion to which they are attached may be. The question is a far reaching one. It affects in the most wide-spread manner the welfare of our population at large, and reaches out to every home in the land. To my mind, however, the privilege of one day's rest in seven carries with it the obligation of faithful service on the other six days. If the two principles could be combined and made universal, a very large proportion of the vice and poverty of the world would vanish.

While it is true that all men cannot be expected to have their religious convictions cast in the same mould, the present question may be entirely separated from religion, since all men of experience and earnest purpose must agree as to the desirableness of one day of rest in seven.

Skilled mechanics tell us that even the most strongly built machine needs rest, for if worked ceaselessly it will break down and wear out prematurely,—much sooner than if allowed its stated time of rest.

How much more then, must the same principle hold true in the case of man? Scientists are unanimous in asserting that the mental and physical powers absolutely demand their periods of relaxation.

Since, therefore, both revelation and nature unite in teaching the same truths, we should do our utmost, I think, to extend to the humblest citizen the blessing of one day's rest in seven.

It is also brought to our notice that we will be invited to consider, among other subjects, bills to amend the Railway Act, the Fruit Marks Act, 'An Act respecting Usury,' and also the Dominion Elections Act. These will all, I have no doubt, receive due consideration; but there is one remark I would like to make—I would not like to say that I would be bound to support all these measures until we have seen them. The only one I would refer to at present is the bill relating to usury. I do not know how far the government intend to go, or how far I myself would follow the govern-

Hon. Mr. McGREGOR.

ment in the matter of usury. We know that the Old Testament denounced the usurer, but at the same time the Great Teacher Himself in his parable of the talents, condemned the man who hid his one talent in the earth, and asked him why he did not go to the exchangers, so that when his lord returned the money might have been repaid with usury. The point to my mind is, where can the line be drawn? What may be usury in one part of this country would not be usury in another. Money is worth more in the west than it is in the east, and I can hardly see where a distinction can be made. I may have two thousand dollars to invest; I may buy a house with one thousand dollars, and lend the other thousand to some one else taking a mortgage as security. If you frame a law so that I must not charge more than six per cent on my mortgage, why do you not confine me to the same figure in the case of rent. I may receive a return of twelve or fifteen per cent for the thousand dollars invested in the house. I cannot myself see any difference, and I cannot see where the government can interfere; but when the matter comes before the House I am sure it will receive our best consideration.

The speech goes on to say:

The accounts for the past year will be laid before you; the estimates for the nine months, embracing a portion of the proposed fiscal year terminating on the thirty-first of March, 1907, will be submitted for your approval at an early day.

This implies, I suppose, that whatever the estimates for the nine months may be, they will be larger in proportion than for three-quarters of an ordinary year because the expenditures will be largely of an annual nature.

In conclusion I may say that in the course of my whole parliamentary experience I do not think I have ever seen a speech from the Throne which contained more that was valuable and less that was objectionable, and I have no doubt that the address which has been moved will be adopted without very much debate, either in this House or in the other. I have now very much pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. gentleman from Lethbridge.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It may seem strange to some hon. gentlemen who heard my utterances at the close of the last