

I am not versed in the law, and I think the bill might well be referred to a standing committee at which officials of the department concerned could attend to clear up any points of difficulty. I do not believe the matter is one of urgency: in any event, the Committee on Natural Resources will meet tomorrow morning.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** May I point out that the Committee on Natural Resources has nothing to do with the legal question raised by my honourable friend? While I have no objection to the bill being referred to that committee, I believe it could be more appropriately remitted to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which is the legal committee.

**Hon. Mr. Robertson:** I may point out that the meetings of the standing committees of the Senate are open to all honourable senators. I am calling a meeting of the Committee on Natural Resources tomorrow morning at 10.30, and those senators who are not members of the committee but who are interested in this bill may attend. I think, too, that honourable senators will find many members of the legal fraternity at the meeting.

The motion was agreed to.

## CULLERS BILL

### SECOND READING

**Hon. Mr. Robertson** moved the second reading of Bill G, an Act to repeal the Cullers Act.

He said: Honourable senators, I have asked the honourable senator from Grandville to explain this bill.

**Hon. P. H. Bouffard:** Honourable senators, this legislation is not of a serious nature. Its object is to repeal an Act which has not been in operation for the past thirty years. The Cullers Act was passed by the parliament of United Canada in 1842, to provide for the measurement and inspection of lumber for export. The Act was limited in its scope, applying only to Quebec and Ontario, and further, it applied only to waney pine and square lumber to be exported. The measurements were made in Montreal and Quebec, and in some parts of Ontario.

Since 1867 both Ontario and Quebec, the two provinces mainly concerned with the Cullers Act, have passed legislation of their own for the measurement and inspection of all kinds of timber cut on Crown lands, which still includes the bulk of the cut in these provinces. This meant a double inspection and measurement. As a matter of fact, from 1894 to 1920 the amount of lumber measured under the Cullers Act in Quebec and Montreal was so small that the department closed

its offices in 1921. At the present time in Quebec and Ontario, lumber, whether or not it is for export, is measured and inspected by cullers appointed under the respective Acts of the two provinces. This method has proved satisfactory, and there is no complaint whatsoever as to the measurement and inspection of lumber. Exporters who fail to have their lumber inspected by federal cullers are subject to fines and penalties; yet there are no cullers to make the inspection. I suggest to honourable senators that the only course to take with respect to an Act that has not been operative for the last thirty years is to repeal it.

**Hon. Mr. Leger:** Can the honourable gentleman inform me whether there are still any annuitants under the act?

**Hon. Mr. Bouffard:** In 1921 every officer and man employed on this work was placed on an appropriate annuity by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I understand that in the meantime all but one of these persons have died.

**Hon. Mr. Leger:** If we repeal the Act will that man's annuity cease?

**Hon. Mr. Bouffard:** My information from the Department of Trade and Commerce is that there is no annuity that will cease on account of the repeal of this Act. The man referred to was retired under the Superannuation Act, not under the Cullers Act, and so would not be affected at all by repeal of the Cullers Act.

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

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from yesterday the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Farquhar for an Address in reply thereto.

**Hon. Iva C. Fallis:** Honourable senators, in rising to participate in this debate, I should like first to join the speakers who have preceded me in paying tribute to the mover (Hon. Mr. Farquhar) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Comeau) of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It was my privilege to be for three years a member of the Joint Committee on the Indian Act, of which the mover of the Address was also a member. I found him there to be an able and hard-working parliamentarian, and I know he will be a valuable acquisition to this house. Unfortunately it was not possible for me to be present when the seconder of the address was