

(a) The actual condition as to the amount and character of the assets and liabilities (direct and indirect) of the undertakings conducted by it as on 31st December last preceding;

(b) The cash transactions, including receipts and disbursements for the year ending on 31st December last preceding;

(c) The revenues, income and interest earned and the amount of the costs, expenses and other items chargeable there against in connection with the operation, maintenance, administration and conduct of the undertakings controlled by it for the year ending 31st December last preceding;

Now, we come to the provision relating to the ensuing year:

(d) The amounts, with the expected sources of the same, which it is estimated will be received in cash or its equivalent and the payments, loans and advances with the purpose of the same, which it is contemplated shall be made in cash or otherwise, in the next succeeding year;

(e) The amounts and particulars of the obligations and liabilities which it is contemplated shall be incurred in the next succeeding year;

(f) The securities or evidence of indebtedness which it is contemplated shall be created, issued, sold or otherwise disposed of, together with the method of dealing with the same in the next succeeding year

You see, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the Hydro-Electric Commission to provide the Legislature of Ontario with an estimate of the money that they expect to expend during the coming year. This Bill fails to do that. This Bill gives the board of directors power to expend money without any reference to Parliament at all. It provides that an accounting shall be given after the money is spent. That is what we object to. That is locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. The Hydro-Electric Commission has to give an estimate of every dollar it expects to spend in the ensuing year and it is authorized by the Legislature. Then, there is this other section:

Where the Legislature has appropriated money for the purposes of the Commission, such money shall be payable out of such appropriation to the Commission from time to time, upon the requisition of the Chairman of the Commission and the direction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in such amounts and at such times as shall be stated in the requisition and direction, and this section shall have effect notwithstanding that there may be sums due from the Commission to the province and notwithstanding anything in The Audit Act contained.

This shows that the system that is in force with regard to the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario is exactly the system that is advocated by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). There is a provision for the accumulation

of a reserve fund but that reserve fund has to be under the supervision of the comptroller and the cheques have to be signed by him. If the cheques and guards that are furnished under this Hydro-Electric Act had been contained in the Act which is now before the House, there would be no cause of complaint in regard to this matter on this side of the House and the amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens would not be necessary. The hon. the Leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) cannot get any comfort at all from the system adopted by the Hydro-Electric Commission in the province of Ontario.

My hon. friend stated to the House that it is impracticable to adopt the proposition of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens. But he does not tell us why it is impracticable. He has given no good reason. It has not been found impracticable in the case of the Intercolonial railway for the last forty years; in the case of the New Zealand railways, and in the case of the railways of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Commonwealth of Australia is a very large country. The transactions in connection with the railways are scattered over that vast continent; yet the system we advocate here has not been found impracticable there.

My hon. friend has said that it is impracticable, but he has not given us good ground for that statement. The difference is that in the one case we have parliamentary control, and in the other case we have not. I also object to the provision of section 26 of this Act because it enables the company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to bond the whole line up to \$75,000 a mile. There are no bonds on the Intercolonial railway at the present time, but as I understand this Bill it gives the power to the directors of this company, with the consent of the Governor in Council, to bond some eighteen hundred miles of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways, up to the amount of \$75,000 a mile. That would secure some \$112,000,000 which they could use in building railways and railway extensions in Western Canada, or elsewhere in this country, without any consent on the part of this Parliament. The whole question is amply provided for under the existing law; we have the Audit Act which makes very careful provision in regard to the expenditure of money. The moneys paid in to the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Railways, and the Postmaster General, all become part of the consolidated revenue of Canada,