

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not the same with timber and lumber as well ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I am just taking that as an example. I would suggest to the promoter of this Bill that we take up something else and consider this a little further, because I have some strong views on the question myself.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before we consider that point, may I ask whether this Bill was before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee ? I see that an important part of the Bill has relation to commercial industries. We have a committee specially charged with the examination of Bills of this kind. They are not supposed to be dealt with by the Railway Committee and if this Bill has not been reported on by the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee I think it had better be postponed until it has been referred to that committee so that we may have the benefit of the opinions of the experts in commercial transactions, who are supposed to sit on that committee. The Bill is certainly an extraordinary one. It involves commercial transactions, just as much as it does railway building ; in fact, I am not sure but that the clauses not appertaining to the construction of a railway would not be in the end the more important part of the Bill. I submit that so long as we have select committees to consider the various Bills which come before the House they should not be considered in the House until these committees have reported upon them, and if the promoters of railway Bills will persistently insert in railway charters clauses such as reference has been made to, we should refuse the consideration of such Bills until they have been reported upon by other appropriate committees as well as the Railway Committee. Comparatively few members were at the Railway Committee when this Bill was considered, we know very little about it and it would certainly be much better that the Bill should be considered by the other committee as well ; then let them bring down their report and if it is approved by that committee we would have more confidence in passing it even although we had not had the opportunity of getting the details of all its various clauses. I raise that objection to the Bill now, and if it is not referred to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee before it is taken up again I shall take a decided stand, raise that objection and ask that it be referred to the committee before we consider it further here. I think a point of order on that line would be well taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a dim recollection that somewhere around where the sealed pattern of the Ross rifle is, or somewhere else, there is a model railway Bill. Does the minister know whether there is or not ? I would like to have that model trotted out at least once in a decade so that it might

Mr. GRAHAM.

stand as an example of what might be avoided.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The promoters of this Bill drew it on the plan of the various other Bills that have gone through the Railway Committee. The statement of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is undoubtedly true. I think that railway charters should refer to railways and not to other industries, but if this has been a matter of common practice I cannot see why it should be changed in this particular instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman give us the name of a railway Bill that has as wide powers as this one ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I think that if you look at the Grand Trunk branch lines you will find identically the same clause as that which has been referred to by the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. That is where the trouble comes ; it was a government Bill.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. There is another Bill which went through last session which is practically the same and that is the Bill incorporating the Dunvegan road. I do not know that I can give the exact title of it. But we will have an opportunity to look at the various Bills which have been passed and make a comparison between them and the provisions contained in this Bill. This Bill is planned on various other Bills and we are not asking for something which has not been granted to other companies. In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) I will say that other Bills went through in the same way without being referred to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee or any other committee but the Railway Committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Whilst it may have been the case that a goodly number of Bills have gone through this House it has not been the absolute practice because I have a distinct recollection of a Bill of this very character having been referred to both committees, referred to the Railway Committee, certain clauses dealt with there, and referred to the Private Bills Committee for consideration of the commercial clauses. As I said before if the promoters of these mixed Bills persistently present them in this form I think that in future they ought to understand that their Bills must have the approval of both committees before they will be proceeded with in the House. I think that is only reasonable. What do we send a Bill to the committee for ?—to have it investigated with reference to the purpose that is intended to be accomplished by the Bill. The Railway Committee is only intended to deal with a Bill providing for the construction and operation of a railway. The Private Bills Committee has a duty to perform