

On section 7—Tariff of fees and by-laws must be approved before stock yard is used:

Mr. BURRELL moved that the words "and charges" be inserted after the word "fees" in the third line of the clause and the words "and charges" after the word "fees" in the eighth line.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 7, subsection 2—Stock yard may be closed when not operated in accordance with regulations:

Mr. MORPHY: I think the wording of this subsection is rather restrictive. There might be a stock yard in charge of some one who was not the "owner" or "operator." I could imagine a case where a stock yard might have gone into disuse for a little while and there would be no person on whom notice could be served who might be called the owner or operator. I would suggest that the word "owner," "lessee, occupier or operator" should be used.

Mr. BURRELL: There would be no objection to putting that in. I therefore move that the section be amended by inserting after the word "owner" in the first line the words "lessee, occupier or operator;" that the words "lessee, occupier" be inserted after the word "owner" in the 34th line and that the words "lessee, occupier or operator" be inserted after the word "owner" in the 38th line.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—How Act may be made applicable to stock yards now in existence:

Mr. BURRELL: To meet the point raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), I beg to move that the following subsection be added:

The minister shall have power to decide whether any public market where live stock is purchased and sold, hereafter established, as a stock yard is to be operated under this Act.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood an amendment was inserted after section 3 to provide that any owner of stock could sell his own stock at any stock yard. Is there any restriction on any person coming to the stock yard to buy?

Mr. BURRELL: No, I should think not.

Mr. OLIVER: Last winter buyers came from Seattle.

Mr. BURRELL: I should think there would be absolutely no restriction.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. OLIVER: The establishment of a stock exchange would not prevent outside buyers coming to the stock yards and buying?

Mr. BURRELL: No. The intention was to control only the commission side of it.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 121, an Act to amend an Act in aid of provincial legislation prohibiting or restricting the sale or use of intoxicating liquors.—Mr. Doherty.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a funny Government. I mean it is made up of funny members. They tell us at six o'clock what they are going to take up at eight o'clock, and then they take up something else. We were told at six that we would take up to-night the Live stock Bill and then Estimates, and now the Minister of Justice comes along with a temperance measure. Perhaps it is inoffensive and we may let him go; but I call attention to the fact that about four times a week the Government take up business other than that of which they have given notice.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sorry if my hon. friend finds this measure offensive. I shall explain it briefly and then he can get to his Estimates. This is a measure that has come back from the Senate with amendments that, I may be pardoned for saying, do not, in my judgment, improve it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: About the papers?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member says, "about the papers." The hon. gentlemen in the place which perhaps I should not discuss seemed to be under the same misapprehension as the hon. member for Rouville, that this is a Bill about the papers; and so they have struck out a provision in section 2 of the Bill which simply provided that it should be an offence to use the post office as a means of violating constitutionally enacted provincial laws. As I am informed, they have interpreted that as being legislation by this Parliament to prohibit the circulation of newspapers containing liquor advertisements, because it was possible that a province might prohibit that. The section in question simply declared that it should be an offence to use the post office as a messenger for the violation of properly enacted provincial law. The Senate have struck that out because, I presume, in their