

ing the years 1904-5, 1905-6, 1906-7 and 1907-8, to Drouin Brothers and Company, of Quebec, merchants, for goods and merchandise?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The answers are as follows :

1. Drouin Frères & Company, 1904-5, \$1,504.07; 1905-6, \$9,948.62; 1906-7, \$6,751.10; 1907-8, \$14,188.36.

PACIFIC COAST FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK moved the third reading of Bill (40) An Act respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.

He said: When this Bill was under discussion the other day, I was not able to give all the information which some hon. gentlemen wished with regard to it. Since that time I have looked into the matter and found that the company is in a very satisfactory condition. I have obtained from the Superintendent of Insurance a statement which shows that the affairs of the company are in a very good state, the directors of it at the present time are responsible men.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (147) An Act to repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Hon. Mr. Scott.)

Bill (149) An Act to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Hon. Mr. Scott.)

Bill (RR) An Act for the relief of Catharine Cannon.—(Hon. Mr. Baird.)

Bill (UU) An Act for the relief of Adamaturan Stewart Paulding.—(Hon. Mr. Derbyshire.)

Bill (VV) An Act for the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Hon. Mr. Derbyshire.)

DOMINION LUMBERING AND POWER DEVELOPMENT COMPANY'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN moved the third reading of Bill (H) An Act to incorporate the Dominion Lumbering and Power Development Company.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—I gave notice of the following amendment, that the said Bill

Hon. Mr. LANDRY.

be not now read a third time but that it be amended by striking out clause 5 of the said Bill. It will be remembered that I have taken the ground right along that private Bills should go to a Committee of the Whole House. There was a good deal of important discussion on this Bill in the Railway Committee, and many members of the Senate who are not members of the Railway Committee were not present when this Bill was under discussion there. Therefore, it is nothing but right that it should be brought before the House for discussion. Clause 5 of the Bill is as follows:

5. The provisions of any general Act of the legislature of the province of Ontario or of the province of Quebec, now or at any time hereinafter in force, shall in so far as such provisions are not inconsistent with The Electricity Inspection Act, 1907, The Electricity and Fluid, Exportation Act, of any other general Act relating to the transmission and distribution of electricity hereafter passed by the parliament of Canada, apply to the works and operations of the Company.

If parliament has a right to pass this Bill at all, I do not see why this clause should be inserted. If we have no right to pass it, of course we should not pass it. The question of provincial rights has been discussed in this House for the last two or three years, and I think the sooner we come to a conclusion that no Bill of this kind shall be put through this House with any such clause, the better. There is a way out of this difficulty. If we pass this Bill without clause 5, and either the people of the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario are not satisfied, or think that it is an infringement of provincial rights, they can do as Sir Oliver Mowat did when he was Prime Minister of Ontario, take it to the proper court and get a decision of the court as to whether we are right or wrong. I do not think this House has a right to interpret the constitution or the law. We are supposed to make laws, and the court is the proper place to have them interpreted, and if we are going to pass this Bill at all, we should cut out section 5 and let the Bill go. If Ontario or Quebec—and they are the only provinces affected—think it infringes on their rights in any way, the proper thing for them to do is to carry it to the courts and get a decision as to what are our rights and what are not. I think the sooner