

the present Speaker took that room from them, and they had to put up with their present accommodation. I am informed that you, Mr. Speaker, do not find it necessary to use that room, but I understand that it has been occupied as a private room by some members of this House on the back benches, and, I think, in view of the limited accommodation we have, before those members are considered the *Hansard* reporters ought to be considered, because we know what their work is and how difficult it is for them to perform it in a room such as they now have. I hope the Minister of Public Works will promise that he will at once see that these gentlemen have better accommodation provided, for it is impossible for them to do their work with any view to comfort or even to health in the room they now have.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember that the hon. gentleman called my attention to this matter last year, and I enquired about it; but the hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is, when rooms are occupied, to evict the tenants, and therefore, I have not found it possible to accede to his recommendation of last year. However, now that my attention has been called to this matter again, I think I will be able to give some more accommodation, or certainly will try to do so, to these reporters, who certainly deserve more room than they now have.

#### POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish now to answer the question which was put by the leader of the Opposition yesterday, who wanted to know whether I was ready, either to-day or on any other day, to make a statement as to the policy of the Government. I have this to communicate to the House: The Government proposes to carry out the policy which has hitherto guided the Liberal-Conservative party, the outlines of which, in respect to the measures of this session, are indicated in the Speech from the Throne. The trade and financial policy will be declared in the Budget speech.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot say that the declaration just made by the leader of the House takes me in any way by surprise.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say to my hon. friend that this practice of raising discussion on ministerial statements has, I think, reached a point that requires my intervention by calling for the Orders of the Day. It will be remembered that yesterday the discussion went on at considerable length, and I think it is about time that the practice should be put a stop to. I would ask the House to sustain me in endeavouring to put down that practice which, I think, if it continues to grow as it has done this session, will become a very inconvenient one for Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. I bow to your ruling, and will give my humble assistance in carrying out your very safe policy. I did not rise for the purpose of criticizing the statement of the hon. Minister, but simply to point out to him that the promise of the Government somewhat reminds me of a certain place which is said to be paved with good intentions. I have no doubt at all that they want to follow the policy of the late Sir John Macdonald, but, in my estimation, they have already departed

from it very widely, as I will, to-morrow, endeavour to convince the Government and the House.

#### PREVENTION OF FRAUDS.

The Order being read for House in Committee on Bill (No. 42) to prevent fraud in the sale of certain articles (Mr. Burdett),

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Justice that if he is in favour of this Bill, as he appears to be, the object of the Bill can be better obtained, in my judgment, by referring it to a select committee. It is an important Bill, and it cannot be as thoroughly considered in Committee of the Whole as it can be by half a dozen members sitting and quietly deliberating upon it. It may become necessary to enlarge the scope of the Bill to some extent, and it may become necessary to consider carefully the phraseology of the Bill, and I submit that that can be better done by a select committee than by the Committee of the Whole.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection at all to that course, if it commends itself to the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge, although it seems to me that the Bill is very carefully drawn.

Mr. BURDETT. I agree to the proposition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suggest that perhaps it might be well for the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett) to take a little time to select those members to whom he would like to refer the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the Minister consent that the reference of the Bill to a select committee should be made later on in the day?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

#### NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Langelier for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, papers, reports and documents in relation to the returning of the debentures of the North Shore Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer given by the Minister of Justice to my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) requires, perhaps, a word in reply on my part, though a single word only. The answer given by the hon. Minister of Justice was, in the first place, that the Government of Canada had not at all interfered with the Canadian Pacific Railway to prevent them from improving the line of railway formerly known as the North Shore Railway. This was not at all the gist of the charge made by my hon. friend. He did not at all complain of the interference by the Government with the conduct of the North Shore Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but he stated that by the action of the Government the Canadian Pacific Railway were placed in such a position that they had no object in improving the line, but, on the contrary, if they did improve it, they made their position towards the Government worse than it was before, and that until that position had been rectified the company allowed the road to deteriorate and would not at all attempt to make it better than it was. That is the gist of the charge