

give to the Railway Commission the power of fixing the passenger rate per mile. If the municipalities have such an arrangement with these companies, I think the arrangement should be protected in this Bill and that the municipalities should not be wholly dependent on the protection to be given by the Railway Commission.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) has overlooked section 10 which expressly provides that all arrangements made with municipalities shall be adhered to and that if there is any conflict between these agreements and the Railway Act the by-laws and agreements shall prevail to the exclusion of the Railway Act.

Mr. FOSTER. That would protect them fully.

Mr. CLARKE. I think so.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not look carefully into it and I judged by the remarks of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the reply of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that this Bill would not fully protect these agreements.

Mr. GRAHAM. We were not talking particularly of that agreement; we got a little further afield on the two cent rate. I pointed out that this road would be under the Railway Commission as to its passenger rates as well as other things. I did not mean that any contracts with municipalities would be overridden.

Mr. CLARKE. Besides that the municipalities have approved of this clause.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am very much interested in the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and I agree that this is his opportunity to move an amendment. As I understand the rules that is the customary proceeding, to move an amendment in committee. I wish to see an amendment moved because Brantford is very much concerned in that very matter. They sent down deputations to appear before the Railway Committee on several occasions, before the pace became too warm and there were so many meetings that they could not have representatives at them all. I think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) should have a direct assurance from the minister that he will have a proper opportunity to move an amendment if he wishes because there are other municipalities that desire to support such an amendment if it should come before the House.

Mr. CLARKE. The amendment was moved and voted on in the House the other night.

On the preamble.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a motion to be moved that this Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee in order to have the committee give reasons in accordance with the rule why they amended the preamble. The chairman informs me that that question was discussed at a previous meeting and was allowed to pass. Therefore I do not desire to revive it again.

Bill reported.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 47), respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Stewart.

On section 2,

Mr. SPROULE. I have only this further remark to make in regard to this Bill, that before we were asked to extend the time, I think the company ought to have presented to parliament some approximate statement of the expenditure they have made on the undertaking up to the present time. I think also, that the government should take it up themselves, and not leave it in the hands of any private company, because every additional month or year that it runs, there will be additional expenses piled up that the country ultimately will be obliged to pay.

Mr. STEWART. I may say that I asked the solicitor of the company if he could give me the information the hon. gentlemen desired, and he was unable to do so. The criticism by some hon. members was that the company were going on spending money. I may say that they are not now spending money. Knowing that the government are making surveys, they have no desire to duplicate the work. They ceased spending money on surveys, &c., when the matter was taken up by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. That is different from the information which was given to us the last time the Bill was considered. We were told that they were going on spending money. If they are not piling up expenses, I do not see that the objection to the Bill is so very serious.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that all that is required is to prolong the life of this company. They do not propose to go into any operations until the government have made up their mind what they propose to do. May I ask if the field work of the survey is finished?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not sure, but I understand that it is.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.