

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I did not deal with the point, because I thought it was coming up later; but I wanted to point out that the second amendment involved no question of expenditure on the part of this Bill. His demand is to prevent the government from charging the municipalities for the protection of the property of the government. It is not a question of spending money. We are not asking the government to spend money, but we want to lay down the principle that the government has no right to charge the municipality with expenses which it has not lawfully and rightfully incurred.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is clearly a question of Montreal vs. the Dominion.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman seems to assume that the government have something to do with the harbours all over the country. I am not aware that they have. It is the first I have ever heard that they had. I think the harbour masters of Kingston, Collingwood or any other place would be very much annoyed if they heard that the government had any right to dictate terms to them as to the harbour property. The city of Montreal has helped the harbour of Montreal in large sums.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—And they pay a low rate of interest.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is idle to place the city of Montreal on a different basis in this matter from any other portion of the Dominion, and I do not suppose the House would be disposed to entertain a proposition by which the treasury of the country will be taxed especially for the benefit of the city of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. FORGET—I do not think it is the city of Montreal alone. I think it is unfair to mention Montreal.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—What other cities besides Montreal and Quebec are there? We do not hear of it from St. John or Toronto?

Hon. Mr. FORGET—I represent the district of Sorel, and in that district the government owns a great deal of property and owns the Sorel shops. I do not know exactly the name of the municipality where

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

they are located. The government employs three or four hundred men.

Hon. Mr. THIBAudeau (Rigaud)—Double that.

Hon. Mr. FORGET—Supposing there was a strike there to-morrow and the militia were called out, would it be fair to saddle that municipality with the expense of ten or fifteen thousand dollars? I do not suppose their revenue is more than \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year. Many of the men who work in the shops reside in Sorel. I do not think they have the means of paying for such protection; they are too poor. A strike might be provoked there on account of the men not being paid enough wages, and would it be fair that the municipality where the shops are should be compelled to pay for the expense of quelling that strike? I think it would be most unjust.

Hon. Mr. OWENS—The same thing would apply to other government works. The Grenville or Carillon canal, for instance, where a riot might take place. It would be equally unfair to call on the adjoining municipality to pay for the protection of government property there. It is not a matter of the city of Montreal against the Dominion; it is simply a question of the government defending their own property, and not calling upon the adjoining municipalities to pay for something in which they are not specifically interested. I would support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—Do I understand the hon. gentleman to lay down the principle that all properties not taxable shall protect themselves?

Hon. Mr. OWENS—No, but if the government owns the property the government should protect it.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—Does the hon. gentleman contend that all properties which are not taxable in the province, which do not pay municipal taxes, shall be called upon to protect themselves in case of trouble?

Hon. Mr. OWENS—The motion is not dealing with that question at all. It is dealing with government property, and the government should protect their own property.

The House divided on the amendment, which was lost on the following division: