

lay the papers on the table or hand them to the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) tomorrow.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Mr. J. BARR. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to a question previously asked with regard to the franking privilege of members.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The matter has been arranged in accordance with what I understood to be the wish of this House. I do not want the House to think that I am dominating their view. I understood the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to suggest that, instead of adhering to the decision of the House of some time ago, that the actual signature or the initials of a member should be required, we might still allow a stamp to be used on condition that the member whose stamp is being used should deliver the mail matter to the postmaster himself. The Deputy Postmaster General informs me that that can be arranged, and he is sending a letter on the subject to the postmaster here.

Mr. BARR. That is satisfactory.

PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM DREDGING CONTRACT.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. Can the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) inform me if the contract has been let for dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William? The time for tendering, I think, expired on the 1st instant. If the contract has been let, would the acting minister say who are the successful tenderers?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract has not been signed, but the Order in Council to let the contract has been passed. The successful tenderer is A. F. Bowman. I do not recollect the particulars. Some ten or twelve tenderers were included in the schedule submitted to Council.

Mr. BENNETT. Is A. F. Bowman the Great Lakes Dredging Company?

Mr. HYMAN. The Great Lakes Dredging Company—I speak from recollection—were also tenderers, but the lowest tenderer was A. F. Bowman.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA AND NEW YORK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 92) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.

Mr. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In the printed Bill there is only one clause. But I understand that another clause has been added, which is not open to objection.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. HYMAN. If I may be permitted, I will read the second clause, which was added in committee:

The directors may annually appoint from among themselves an executive committee composed of at least three directors, for such purposes and with such powers as the directors by by-law determine; and the president shall be ex-officio member of said committee.

Mr. DANIEL. What is to become of section 1?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall move that section 1 be struck out. It was understood when this Bill was under discussion the other night that there would be a motion to strike out section 1 as reported by the Railway Committee, and that there could be little if any objection to section 2 as now contained in that amended Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are on the preamble now.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would ask the government to define their policy in the matter of the creation of executives and in the management of large companies. There are some very large interests in this country controlled by boards of directors, and we have in some instances allowed these directors to appoint executive committees of three to administer the affairs of the company. Now if that is to be an accepted principle the public ought to know it. I take objection to it for instance in the case of insurance companies that have large trusts to handle. I object that an executive should be appointed to take control, say, of the funds of an insurance company. It is well worth the attention of the government, and a declaration as to whether they intend to allow great corporations to be managed, to all intents and purposes, by a small executive of three. I believe it is the case in the matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was refused in the case of the Canada Life Insurance Company. I would like to know the underlying rule of the government in these matters.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not view this question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as one of public policy. It is not a question of policy. Each case must be determined upon the merits surrounding it. There may have been some good reason for withholding the privilege from the Canada Life Insurance Company; I presume that the committee of that day considered that there were strong reasons why the privilege should not be accorded. They have granted it in several instances. It is not a question of governmental policy. I presume that in the case of the Canada Life Insurance Company it was the judgment of the committee that the privilege should be refused.

Preamble agreed to.