

Mr. LADNER: Do I understand the Prime Minister to intimate that the negotiations are still open, notwithstanding the intimation of the Prime Minister of Australia that they had been closed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend had been in his seat the other day he would have heard my reply to the intimation which he has just made. I do not view the remarks of the Prime Minister of Australia in the same way that my hon. friend does.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it correct that Mr. Ross, who was to go back to recontinue the negotiations, has not yet gone?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think he is expected to leave this week.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS— INJURY TO EMPLOYEE ON DUTY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of the House to the fact that owing to the coolness and presence of mind of a trainman and the engineer on an Intercolonial train the other day a very serious accident was averted and the lives of several people saved? But the engineer was very seriously hurt, and I do not think he will be able to work in that capacity in future. Is it the intention of the government to award anything to this man so that he may be able to maintain himself and his family? His name is Mr. Gagnon.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): This matter has not been called to the attention of the government before, but I can assure my hon. friend that it will be given every consideration. I might point out that these matters now always emanate from the Canadian National board in a report, on which the government acts or declines to act.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): It is now about a week and a half since the termination of the budget debate, but the bills representing the government policy as respects important matters are still un-introduced. May I ask particularly with respect to the railway rates question—when may we expect a statement of the government's policy or a bill representing it?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): It is now under consideration. It is a very important bill. Mistakes have been made before, I am told, even in the drafting of legislation, and the government wants to be sure that no mistakes are made this time. The bill will be introduced in plenty of time this session to give hon. members opportunity for full discussion.

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. T. A. LOW (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend and consolidate The Canada Grain Act, chapter 27 of the statutes of 1912, and amending Acts, and to make further provisions in respect to the handling and marketing of grain, or incident to the buying, selling and transportation of grain; the grading and weighing of grain; the handling of grain in and out by country elevators and at country points and inspection of such elevators; the operation, management and control of terminal, public and private elevators; the storing, cleaning and binning of grain; the mixing of grain and the disposition of screenings.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, this is a most remarkable resolution to precede a bill. The purpose of a resolution which is to precede a bill is to embody the principles of the bill and virtually all the terms, or, if not all the terms of the bill, certainly all the important terms; otherwise the resolution does not serve its purpose at all: it is valueless; it is a waste of time. The rules of the House call for an introductory resolution, but you do not meet the rule by a simple resolution declaring that a certain act should be amended, which is all that this resolution does. It says, "Resolved that it is expedient to amend and consolidate The Canada Grain Act, chapter 27 of the statutes of 1912, and amending acts, and to make further provisions in respect to the handling and marketing of grain." Well, what provisions? I presume it is expedient to do it if the provisions are an improvement, but what is the sense of the House resolving that it is in the public interest to make an amendment of the provisions as to the handling of grain when we do not know what the provisions are? I submit to you as a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution is not a compliance with the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: If the right hon. gentleman will allow me to quote Bourinot, I find on page 496: