

Hon. Mr. DAVID—The question of money does not arise, because the government will call on the permanent force.

Hon. Mr. POWER—There will be the expense of transportation.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—It is not a necessary consequence of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not think the House would be disposed to make any exception in favour of Montreal and Quebec. I think they ought to have police force enough to keep under control the body of men who look after a ship. If the police supervision in Montreal had extended far enough, the strikes would not have been serious. It was simply on account of the lethargy of the authorities.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—The hon. Secretary of State may say what he likes against my amendment, but his remarks do not apply to all the ports under the control of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It never occurred anywhere else.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The principle involved in the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman, so far as the maritime provinces are concerned, and where the harbour commissioners are under the control of the government, I think, is a very good one; but I question whether we have the power to enact it. It is throwing on the government a liability, and the Senate has no power to do that. It incurs a liability or charge upon the revenue, which is against our constitution to meddle with.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I am not ready to say that my opinion is better than that of the hon. gentleman, who has had more experience, but I reserve my amendment for the third reading, and will consider how I can answer the objection.

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—It is scarcely fair to speak of the cities of Montreal and Quebec as not open to special privileges, but so it is; the Harbour Commission of Montreal is really and truly a government department. The majority of the members are appointed by the government. They are ruled by the government, and the territory which they administer is not un-

der the control of the city, nor is it owned by the city, and the port is essentially a port of the Dominion. It is a fair argument, therefore, that the expenses of administering that port and policing it, ought well to be considered by the government, and I think the amendment which has been suggested by the last speaker is a fair and reasonable one.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I drew attention to the fact that the port of Montreal goes much beyond the limits of the city of Montreal, and difficulties, friction and strikes may take place at the west or east of Montreal, and it may develop on the front of the city of Montreal, coming from the neighbouring municipalities, and yet when the militia is called out, it is always the city of Montreal that has to pay for the maintenance of that militia during the time of riot.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—I am not one of those who want to impose upon Montreal anything that is unfair, but I cannot conceive why the port of Montreal should not take care of matters of this kind, just as all other districts of the country do.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—So it does, but there are two claims put forward, because it is a public port, and because the government have jurisdiction over certain ports. They have jurisdiction over the entire distance between Montreal and Quebec. Their jurisdiction is not confined to Montreal. It extends along the St. Lawrence river from Montreal to Quebec.

Hon. Sir GEORGE DRUMMOND—Not at all.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—The Harbour Commission control, just as they do in Montreal, the entire distance, but under any circumstances, I for one cannot conceive why this matter should be different in the city of Montreal from any other portion of Canada, or any ports.

Hon. Mr. FORGET—That is what we claim.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—It is true the city of Montreal is, in a sense, a national port; but the whole country is contributing to maintain it as a great national port, and I