

that point, I certainly would not be one to advocate the granting of rights to the company. Already they have that right, and we have no means of overcoming it, and they have flooded many acres of land in that vicinity and interfered with the farming community. That trouble exists at the present time. Why should we refuse the right of generating more power there, to enable the village of Dunnville and other places to further their interests in manufacturing industries? As far as clause 17 is concerned, we find that no injustice can be done to any party. It must be brought into operation under an order in council, and I must confess, and gladly do so, that the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Marshfield is a true and correct principle that we ought to follow in this instance. It is not a private company; it is a public company. The water-power has been there for some time; they have industries established, I know not how long, and it is by means of these industries that the village of Dunnville is the prosperous place it is. Although they have this water-power, you say to them that they shall not use it for any other purpose than merely running mills. Would hon. gentlemen prevent the people of Dunnville from having the same rights and privileges which we have been granting to hundreds of other municipalities? I think it would not be fair. I do not believe any hon. gentleman who has examined carefully the condition of the country about Dunnville and the industries along this stream, would feel disposed to act on sentiment, because I must say it is a very easy thing for some hon. members to swallow themselves in reference to provincial rights and provincial powers without any hesitation or difficulty. They say one thing one day, and perhaps the next day a different thing. My hon. friend has ears to hear, and has a right to change his opinion, and he is systematically doing that, and to-day he is opposing this Bill upon the principle of it being within the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. I strongly contend that hon. gentlemen here, if they knew the locality, would say that the water-power that is going to develop new industries there ought to be granted. I believe that it will develop industries there. The town of Dunnville ought to be

encouraged. They were in a backward condition for a long time, and the flooding of the country above the stream is not going to be increased in any way whatever to the injury of the farming community more than it is at the present time. Therefore I shall vote for the third reading of the Bill.

The amendment was lost on a division.

The main motion was carried, and the Bill was then read a third time and passed.

COURT OF APPEAL FOR MANITOBA BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (195) An Act respecting the Court of Appeal for Manitoba.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 1,

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Does this provincial statute come into operation by proclamation?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes. The controverted elections are to be tried in the Court of Appeal, and those changes in the Bill are consequent upon that.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 3,

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Does my hon. friend know whether this is to be a court of appeal, or a court of original jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is a Court of Appeal. I endeavoured to inform myself on it, but they did not send down a copy of the Act. I suppose there is a copy in the Justice Department. I shall endeavour to procure a copy before the third reading.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 7,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The salaries are put on a par with the salaries paid to judges of the Court of King's Bench and the courts in Toronto. The chief justice gets \$8,000, and the puisne judges \$7,000 each.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I think clause 7 should not form part of this Bill, but should