

ment has granted to some of these subsidiary companies the subsidies set forth in the report of the Minister of Railways for the current year? It is self-evident that if the present Government has seen fit to grant over three hundred thousand dollars to the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway, one of the subsidiary companies mentioned in the present schedule, we do not own all the capital stock of this company; hence we shall be forced to find the money necessary to make a success of these different companies. Where are the men who are going to come along and offer us the 40 per cent or 45 per cent of the stock that is out of our hands and that will be drawing dividends. Are they not the same men who sold us the capital stock of the present company and who were not in a position to deliver the capital stock of the various subsidiary companies?

In the presence of these facts we have the right to be sceptical and to wonder whether public ownership of these railways will be successful.

We evidently have the right to feel dubious in this regard and we on this side of the House are really very, very doubtful.

But we own the railways, say some hon. members on the other side; we own the capital stock of the railway companies; the Acting Prime Minister himself tells us: "We own the capital stock but we do not own the real estate." Why? Because this real estate is in the hands of the same notorious speculators who sold us this worthless stock, and who to-day are waiting for us to revive it at the public's expense, so that they may get back the value of the railway bonds they never parted with.

Even before Confederation, under the Union—an administration that worked untold harm to the country—the foremost orators and the most ardent patriots of the day fought for the establishment of the Budget system so as to bring all expenditure under the control of Parliament. The fight was a hard one. Some members of Parliament, a few ministers even, had to resign their seats in the Assembly, and it was only after years of struggle that Parliament finally obtained control of all expenditures drawn from the Public Treasury.

Now, this very day, by accepting section 16 which has been brought down to the House, we will go back to those frightful days of 1840 and 1845 when the country was governed by an exclusive clique, a sort of family compact.

However, I am not surprised to find this clause here. Last session we witnessed a

[Mr. Déchéne.]

similar attempt to withdraw several hundred million dollars from the control of Parliament. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, a certain resolution presented by the hon. Minister of Railways whereby he asked the House to authorize the spending of some \$50,000,000 for the purchase of railway material not only for the Government railways but for those railroads also which were financially unable to help themselves, and not for one year alone but for the duration of the war? Thanks to the opposition of members on this side of the House the resolution remained on the Order Paper until the last days of the session, when the hon. Minister of Railways, realizing that he would never succeed in getting it passed, withdrew it himself.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the same attempt is being made, this year, in a more concrete form. As the hon. minister has not succeeded in the course of last session, he is trying again, this year, in a way which is far more grievous and more dangerous to the country, by entrusting to the care of his officials the management of an important part of the people's money. Therefore, I think we are now doing away with the principle which should guide all legislation, whether federal or provincial, that is the control by Parliament of all the monies spent in behalf of the country. After so many battles fought for the control of those monies, especially in Nova Scotia previous to Confederation, I am in no way surprised at the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen (Mr. Fielding) proposing to-day an amendment to do away with such abuse. He is merely yielding, here, to the experience which he has acquired when he was himself Minister of Finance and when he saw, in his youth, the public men of his province fighting to obtain a right which we are now about to be deprived of. Those are the reasons why I shall gladly vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne.

The House divided on the amendment of Hon. Mr. Fielding, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	d'Anjou,
Boivin,	Déchène,
Bourassa,	Delisle,
Boyer,	Demers,
Brouillard,	Denis,
Bureau,	Desaulniers,
Cahill,	Deslauriers,
Casgrain,	Duff,
Chisholm,	Ethier,
Copp,	Euler,