

most of them will be readily accepted. There are however one or two that are not so simple and I will put them before the committee as soon as we come to the clauses affected, and then proceed with others.

Short title stands.

On section 2—Inconsistent provisions.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): Does the hon. member for East Hamilton wish to go on now?

Mr. MITCHELL: The question I wish to discuss was raised largely by the minister himself. He said that the government could hardly take the responsibility of providing in this legislation for people who might be thrown out of work through the passing of this act. He left the impression that he could not differentiate between the railways and other industries. I could understand that contention if legislation had been passed or proposed that had for its purpose the laying off of men and women in other industries, for I have always held that neither a government nor any other employer has the right to take away work from the wage-earner or interfere with his ability to earn his living, without assuming some responsibility for that act.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

### After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS

#### CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 42, respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Bradette.

Bill No. 56, respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 60, for the relief of Auguste Burdayron.—Mr. Myers.

Bill No. 61, for the relief of Nora Tulloch Carr.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Alberta Grace Wood.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of Hilda Nice Allen.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 64, for the relief of Mary Louise Robinson Reid.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 65, for the relief of Elizabeth Bernstein Schmerling.—Mr. Lawson.

#### SARNIA-PORT HURON VEHICULAR TUNNEL COMPANY

The house resumed from Monday, April 3, consideration in committee of Bill No. 41, to incorporate the Sarnia-Port Huron Vehicular Tunnel Company.—Mr. Gray.—Mr. Stirling in the chair.

On section 2—Declaratory.

Mr. BENNETT: When this bill was last before the committee I indicated that I thought certain provisions of it were highly unsatisfactory and that the matter should be referred to the appropriate officers of the departments for the purpose of enabling a report to be made and received. The Deputy Minister of Justice has made a report in which he points out that in 1927 we passed an act to incorporate the Detroit and Windsor Subway Company; in 1928, an act to incorporate the St. Clair Transit Company and an act to incorporate the St. Lawrence River Bridge Company, and in 1932 an act to incorporate the Lake of the Woods International Bridge Company, all similar to some extent to this bill. His opinion was that, in view of this fact, he did not think it of practical advantage to question at this time certain provisions of this bill which, but for the acts above referred to, he should have thought questionable.

Leaving aside for the moment the fact that we have enacted the legislation to which I have referred and that but for that fact we should be able to have a different appreciation of this bill from what we now have, I think there is one objectionable feature to which attention might be directed. I daresay that it is within the memory of some members of the committee that the Detroit tunnel is alleged to have cost some \$10,000,000; that securities were floated to the extent of \$18,000,000 and that investors in both Canada and the United States sustained very heavy losses by reason of that fact; that is that the securities which were issued were nearly twice in amount the cost of the tunnel. This bill makes, it seems to me, no adequate provision to safeguard the investors, and the fact that the stock which has usually been referred to as promoters' stock in all measures of this character can be issued on such terms and conditions as the shareholders, who are the promoters, may determine by by-law, makes it important in my opinion that the bill should be recast. But for the fact, as I have said, that this house has enacted in the past similar legislation with respect to which I certainly on one or two occasions expressed grave doubt,