

by some tribunal with the approval of both parties. But he seems to think that that affected my suggestion of this morning. It does not affect it in any way. What I suggested was that inasmuch as we hope and believe that Newfoundland will at some future time be brought within the limits of confederation, it might be advisable, both from an administrative point of view and as an inducement to Newfoundland to enter confederation, that we should leave certain portions of that territory to become part of Newfoundland as a province of confederation and to be administered by the province of Newfoundland. My right hon. friend thought that would not be practicable because it might lead to dissatisfaction in Quebec. I do not see why it should. He has already suggested that if this area were habitable, if it were likely to sustain a large population, he would have been prepared to create it into a new province. Well, if the province of Quebec would be willing, as we may presume from his remarks, to have this territory created into a new province, is there any objection to have a portion only of that territory kept as an inducement to Newfoundland to enter confederation. If there be no dissatisfaction in the one case, I do not see why we should assume that there would be in the other. I looked at it merely from the standpoint of convenience and efficient administration and also from the other very desirable standpoint of our bringing Newfoundland some time within the bounds of confederation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to have your decision, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not there is any material difference between the two amendments—that of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) and that of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)—which makes the last amendment in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment itself, proposed in the first instance, does not seem to stipulate in what manner the preventing of any reduction in the representation of any province, consequent upon the enlargement of the boundaries of any other province, should be arranged for. It is a little indefinite in that respect. Whereas the amendment specifically states that this shall be provided against in the legislation introduced to extend the boundaries. It is a rather fine point but I am not prepared to rule that the amendment to the amendment is out of order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You will find that the resolution itself calling for an extension of the boundaries is the foundation for legislation, and consequently the amend-

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

ment of the hon. member for Colchester, which provides that such extension be accompanied by such conditions as would prevent it prejudicially affecting the representation of any province in parliament, is about as definite as anyone could possibly desire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I desire to suggest a verbal amendment—in the third paragraph of the resolution, to insert the words 'of Manitoba' between 'boundary' and 'as,' making it read 'the eastern boundary to be the present eastern boundary of Manitoba,' and so on.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### DOMINION GUARANTEE COMPANY.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE moved :

That that part of rule 102 relative to the posting of private Bills and also rule 88 relative to fees be suspended in connection with Bill (No. 211) to amend the Act of the present session intitled an Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.

He said : This new Bill is, in effect, an amendment of the Bill passed this session, but under the circumstances, it is necessary to follow in the form of having a new Bill.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the government orders are proceeded with, may I ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if we could have printed copies of the Georgian Bay ship canal report. I understand that the report is in manuscript. If it could be printed it would be very useful. I need not tell the hon. minister that not merely members of parliament but many people outside desire to see this report.

Mr. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). As the report contains quite a large number of maps, it is desirable to print these with the report, and it will take from six weeks to two months before these can be completed. I have an additional typewritten copy of the report which I shall be glad to lay on the table so that hon. members desiring to see it may have an opportunity to do so before the House rises.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the minister does intend to print the report ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. But it will take six weeks to print the maps.

Mr. LANCASTER. Could not the report be sent out first and the maps afterwards ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be better to keep them together.