

should go back to the same committee. With the information which that committee has already obtained, with knowledge of the change made in the Bill, and with the information they would have as to the action of the International Joint Commission, I think the committee should, at an early date this session, report the Bill back to the House with their recommendations. I would suggest to my hon. friend, who has shown so much zeal in promoting this Bill before the House, that he should consider this suggestion. I think the Bill may properly be read a second time now, and in the meantime I will consult with my hon. friend as to the propriety of referring the Bill back to the same committee, with the understanding that the recommendation and report of the committee shall be made, so that the House can possibly deal with the Bill at the present session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) cannot be received with very much favour by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). That hon. gentleman has shown much zeal in promoting this legislation, which, in my humble judgment, is very much needed. I am sorry he has not received from his friends that encouragement which I think is due to the laudable object he has in view. I would have been disposed to support the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) that the Bill should be disposed of in the House and not referred to the committee, were it not that it is so framed as to present some objections. I am highly in favour of such legislation as this, which I believe to be most important, and which I think should have been placed on the statute books of this country before now.

My hon. friend in his Bill makes it a criminal offence to put refuse of any kind into any of the waters of Canada, and he gives the Government power to restrict the operations of the Bill in certain areas. As the Bill is now framed, a man in any remote district in the country, where there is no population or a very sparse population, could not erect a small sawmill on a stream and put the refuse into that stream. That cannot be the aim of my hon. friend. He is anxious that his Bill should apply to certain densely-peopled areas, such as the city of Ottawa, the city of Toronto, and others cities, towns and

villages. Thus, while my hon. friend is anxious to apply this legislation to a city such as Ottawa, he at the same time would subject to penalty any person who puts refuse in waters where no ill effect could possibly arise from that act. The drastic provisions of this Bill would apply to new and remote parts of the country where there could be no possible danger to the public health from putting refuse in the water, whereas in my opinion, they should apply only to the large centres of population where the evils which my hon. friend wishes to prevent are prevalent. Were I a member of the committee I would move to amend the Bill so that the Governor in Council would have the power to proclaim the area to which the provisions of this Bill would apply and to exempt all the rest of the country. I am of the opinion that that would be a more workable provision than the one now contained in the Bill.

I cannot see any force in the objection raised by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we should not proceed with this measure until we get the report of the International Commission. If we had this legislation on this side of the line, it would assist the American Commission in obtaining similar legislation on the other side. It is very important that we should have joint legislation in this matter, but I would not be deterred from going on with the Bill by the objection that we should wait for the report of the International Commission.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: As one of the members of the committee which, during the last two sessions, considered the Bills to which my hon. friend the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has referred, I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. Before doing so, let me say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the objection which he voiced from the point of view of certain cities, some of which he enumerated, was, I think, speaking from memory, met by the other Bill which has been referred to as having been before the committee, namely, the Bill introduced by Senator Belcourt in another chamber. Therefore I would like to ask my hon. friend from Selkirk whether the Bill he has now introduced combines the features of his former Bill with those of the Bill introduced by Senator Belcourt.

Mr. BRADBURY: There is no change in the Bill now before the House from the Bill