

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I should like to point out to the promoter of the Bill that, while public opinion is unanimously in favour of the principle of the Bill, there are at the same time many people who object to some of its details. The waterways of the country may be polluted in two ways, by wholesale and retail. The Bill makes no distinction between pollution by cities, towns and villages, and pollution by an individual who happens to live on the bank of a stream. If the Bill would make a distinction between the two classes, then public opinion undoubtedly favours some such measure as the one before us. As was pointed out when this Bill was before the Senate last year, these provisions might lead to the worst kind of tyranny in rural life. I do not say it will happen, but it is open to any individual to prosecute another for an act that should not be regarded as in any way a contravention of the principle of the Bill. I have heard people raise these objections to the Bill, and I do not wish to see it include provisions whereby an individual could make it difficult for his neighbour to live.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—The Bill is not open to the objection which the hon. gentleman mentions. If he reads it carefully he will be satisfied that it goes no further than an affirmation of the principle which he says he favours. The Bill provides that it shall not go into force until regulations have been made by the Minister of Agriculture. My hon. friend fears that the Bill will be abused by people who wish to be vindictive; his fear is groundless. The Minister of Agriculture, when he comes to make his regulations under the Bill, will provide for such cases as my hon. friend has in mind. He will make distinction between those who pollute the waters by wholesale and those who do so in a small degree. Nobody will be affected by this Bill until regulations have been approved of by the Governor in Council at the instance, and under the direction, of the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I wish to say to the hon. member from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Belcourt) that I cannot be a party, as a public

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT.

representative, to putting the formation of law into the hands of any one person. Some one has described such a course as an outrage.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—It will be by the Governor in Council.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—That does not render it less objectionable. We should make the laws here and not give any minister the right to make laws for the public.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 4, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and Routine Proceedings.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

MOTION.

Hon. Sir GEORGE W. ROSS moved:

That an humble address be presented to H.R.H. The Governor General; praying that His Royal Highness shall submit to this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with respect to tolls on the foreign or coastwise vessels of any nation using the Panama canal.

He said: Before entering upon the discussion of the subject to which my resolution refers, I must first apologize to the Senate in advance for presuming to occupy its attention perhaps to the limit of the endurance of hon. members. As an epitome of the course I propose taking in discussing the Panama canal, let me say I shall first consider its advantages to the commerce of Europe, America, and the eastern coast of Asia, by shortening the distance between the various sea ports on the different coasts of these continents, but more especially the advantages to Canada by putting her at an easy distance between her Atlantic and her Pacific coast and the west coast of South America, with which there is a growing trade; second, I