

applications would not receive equal consideration. The first amendment was negatived without being put to a vote. Another amendment was proposed by Dr. Sproule, and this was negatived on the third reading. A third amendment was also thrown out upon a division. I see my honourable friend from Wentworth (Hon. Mr. Smith) smiling. He was the last man to speak upon this question. I think the vote was 38 to 102. There was a big majority of the House in favour of granting the Governor in Council the right to issue licenses for the export of power.

As I stated at the opening of my remarks, Parliament had granted a charter to the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls, and, as everybody in the House knew, the company was at this time in existence. The only discussion was on the export of power from Niagara Falls. I think my honourable friend from Wentworth (Hon. Mr. Smith) did mention some other powers, but nobody else mentioned any others than those at Niagara Falls.

The principle of controlling the export of power by license was not disputed, the whole discussion being over who should exercise this right. When the present Bill was introduced in the Senate I looked up the House of Commons Hansard to see what reasons were advanced to justify the proposed change of legislation. I found that the mover of the Bill had advanced no other reason than that, electric power being one of our great natural resources and being exported in such increasingly large amounts, it had become necessary to give the control of the export to Parliament. But if the increase in the exports is the chief reason for the proposed change, then what about controlling the export of pulpwood, and wheat, the exports of which have also increased wonderfully? I see no reason why I should change my mind and vote differently from the way I did in 1907. This Bill went through the House of Commons without discussion, and I suppose we shall never know the reason why there was no opposition to it. My contention is that if licenses for the export of power are to be granted by the Crown—and they are privileges of the Crown, as was said by the then Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir Allen Aylesworth)—they should be granted by some department of the Government or by some officer representing the Crown. But if it is agreed that there should be a change in the system which formerly was universally admitted to be the right one, of exporting under a license, then I say that that change should be complete and that all applicants should be subject to the same authority. My right honourable friend from Ottawa (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster) said it was possible that

Parliament might refuse to grant a license. I agree with him there, but I think that Parliament, having granted a company the right to develop electric power and connect its wires with those of an American company, would respect its obligations and act as wisely towards those who have had licenses in the past as towards those who will require them for the first time in the future.

My reason for moving the amendment is that I think it is unfair to have two classes of exporters, or two different authorities to regulate the same thing. If in the past the Governor in Council has not overstepped the bounds of wisdom in issuing licenses, are there any particular reasons now why we should fear that in the future, under the same circumstances, the Governor in Council will be less efficient and impartial? On the other hand, if we think it is in the interests of the country that Parliament should control the export of power, that the question of the advisability or inadvisability of granting the right to export electric power should be submitted to Parliament, then why should this control not be exercised over all companies, including those who now hold licenses and are exporting power? I want my position to be very clear. If it was feared in 1907 that the Governor in Council was too partial a body, too much under the influence of partisan motives, it must be admitted that the House of Commons is far more so. The House of Commons is equally as transitory as the Governor in Council, and just as liable to be influenced by partisan motives. After all, we might say that there is only one stable body, which is not transient and not partisan, and that is the Senate.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: But, if any bill for such a license is defeated in the other House, it will never reach this Chamber for analysis, and we shall be helpless.

Are we justified in changing the system that has been in force since 1907? No new conditions have arisen and all the companies that are now exporting power from Niagara Falls, with one exception, were exporting at that time. The whole subject was thoroughly discussed during two Sessions. The matter came before the Senate and it was amended. The Bill required all companies exporting power to take out a license three months after the law came into force, and in the Senate the three months period was changed to six months. This amendment was agreed to by the House of Commons and the Bill became law.

As I have said before, my sole object in moving this amendment was to discover if