

It was that there should be an equal power developed on each side of Rainy river, but if the Canadian power so developed should not be utilized, the developers should have the right to apply to the Railway Commissioners for a transfer of the power from the Canadian to the United States side. The difficulty with those people who were undertaking the development of the power was this: the work involved a very large expenditure of money and if only one-half of the power developed could be depended upon to earn a revenue the return on their investment would be inadequate, and they wanted to make some arrangement by which they could rent the power on the Canadian side for use in the United States if it was not used in Canada. It would be no advantage to Canada to let it lie there unused, and it is a good thing that the arrangement was made, because that power is now being developed and the company that has undertaken the work will make a magnificent job of it. They have gangs working night and day, light being supplied at night by an electric plant run by steam-power. The improvement will be a great advantage to that portion of Ontario. I earnestly hope that the power developed will be used on the Canadian side and there will be no necessity to apply to the Railway Commission for permission to transfer it to the other side of the river.

There is a clause in the address which has not been touched upon, one which I very much appreciate, and which I hope the government will carry out determinedly. That is in passing an Act with regard to Sabbath observance. I am strongly in favour of legislation of that kind. I do not want any man to be forced to go to church if he does not want to go, but there should be a law in this country which would ensure to every man the opportunity to attend public worship on the Lord's Day and protect him in the enjoyment of the Sabbath as a day of rest. I earnestly hope that such legislation will be submitted, and that it will receive the endorsement of every loyal Canadian. I congratulate the government very heartily on having incorporated this clause in the address, and I hope that the legislation will be brought down and that it will be a measure creditable to them and advantageous to the people of

Canada. I would not have spoken on this subject had it not been for the references made to the legislation of last session. I adhere to what I then said; I hope that all measures submitted to the Senate will be brought down in good time so that we shall be able to give them proper consideration. I do not care what has been the custom in the past. I do not care whether the present government is prepared to compare records with its predecessors. I do not care what the records may show. We have a right to a fair and reasonable opportunity to discuss all measures brought before us, if we are to render to the people of this country any service for what this Chamber costs. I have no doubt last session the Hon. Secretary of State was between two fires. The session had been long, and the government were anxious to close it. Efforts had been made for days I presume to arrange for a day on which they could prorogue parliament, and as the session drew near its close, I suppose the business had to be rushed. I hope that he will convey to the members of the cabinet the fact that the Senate exists and must be given some reasonable time to discuss measures in the closing days of the session.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My statement as to the Indemnity Bill has been challenged. I find in the journals of this House that a message was brought from the House of Commons on the 18th July with a Bill entitled 'An Act to amend the Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons' and that the said Bill was then read the first time. With leave of the Senate on motion of Mr. Scott, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright, the forty-first rule was suspended in so far as the same relates to this Bill, and that it was then read the second time. It was then ordered to be read the third time at the next sitting of the House, but it was not read at the next sitting of the House, not until the day after the 19th July. I find in the Debates the following discussion took place:

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Is there any alteration in the reference to the 15 days' grace?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, it still continues.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—I should like to ask the Secretary of State what the position of the leader of the opposition would be. He is to get a salary. Will he have to resign his seat and be elected again?