

ton, to be told that the factories and industrial establishments on the south side of the Niagara river shall have sixty or seventy per cent of the power of Niagara, whether obtained from the United States side or from our side, and that we shall have to be content with thirty or forty per cent. I do not think that would be satisfactory. Whatever has to be done must be done on a fair and just basis.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Has the local government charge of the power of the Niagara river?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They have assumed it, as my hon. friend knows. The hon. gentleman made some very sharp remarks which somewhat reflected on myself and on the government. He said that we had allowed important Bills to be brought up from the other chamber in the dying days of the session last year and had them put through without proper consideration. With an experience over some thirty odd years in this Chamber, I venture to say our sessions will compare favourably with those of our predecessors. During the eighteen years my hon. friend's government was in power, we had very much more legislation coming down in the last days of the session than has been the case in the last eight years. He particularly alluded to one Bill which he said was put through without proper consideration—the Minnesota Power Bill. If there was one Bill that this Chamber was entitled to credit for full consideration it was that very measure. It was before the committee for two months and they refused to pass it. The promoters wished to give a larger share of the power of the Rainy river to the American side of the stream than to the Canadian side. The committee thought that should not be done, and the matter was held over from time to time. The promotor himself, the main financier himself, the man who was promoting the enterprise, appeared before the committee and gave many reasons why we should not adhere to that principle, but we did adhere to it nevertheless. Two days before the session closed, he gave in. The promotor saw there was no possibility of getting the Bill through unless the company yielded to the principle laid down by the committee, that the power should be developed on both sides simultaneously and that one half the power

should be available on the Canadian side. This was a fair and just principle, although the greater portion of the water came from the Canadian side. At the last moment the promoters consented, and the Bill was changed to suit the views of nine-tenths of the committee. Nobody was prepared to oppose the Bill then; there was nothing further in controversy and, therefore, there was no possible reason why we should withhold the measure. If my hon. friend will recall the facts he will find that the strictures which he made were scarcely applicable to that particular measure. Last session we did what I never remember before. On the last day of the sitting there was not a single Bill before this House. The Supply Bill was carried the day before the House rose, so that as far as the Senate was concerned it could not be said that Bills were rushed through. The measure which occupied our attention during the last two or three days was the change in the Criminal Law relating to trading stamps. My hon. friend from Stadacona, (Hon. Mr. Landry), who fought for the preservation of the trading stamps system, held up the House for a couple of days and that was the legislation which really occupied our attention. It is quite true the Bill known as the Indemnity Bill went through this Chamber perhaps at a rushing rate, but nobody got up to speak against it. My hon. friend was not in the Chamber at the time. I do not know whether he was out of town or simply absent.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. If he refers to the reports he will find I was here and objected to some portions of it. It was another Bill I had reference to.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The Indemnity Bill had been discussed in the caucuses. I myself was never present at any caucus, but I know as a matter of fact that both political parties held caucuses and made up their minds with regard to the Bill. I was led to believe at the time that there were not half a dozen dissentients in the two Houses.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Those were not caucuses in which the senators took part.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know really. I think they did. I have seen senators at caucuses before.