

I desire to ask the Finance Minister, who is aware that the grain growers had a delegation here lately waiting upon the government in regard to the government taking over terminal elevators, and operating them under government control, would this Bill, under that clause, confer certain rights on this company, that might prove embarrassing to the government in carrying out that policy, and entail expense? Are you giving rights under this Bill that would have to be purchased by the government should the government decide to accede to the request of the grain growers?

Mr. FIELDING. My impression is that we would not. This is simply an enabling Bill which authorizes them to do certain things which an individual might do for himself, and which they are permitted to do in their corporate capacity. I do not think the Bill would create any vested rights that we would have to purchase. Possibly the company might think they would have such rights.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to have an explanation of the provisions of this section 3.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the Bill had better stand.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 140) for the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—Mr. A. Haggart.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—Mr. Verville.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. I did not understand that the Becancour wharf item had passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was carried.

Mr. MONK. Well, my hon. friend invited me to criticise each one of these items, a task which I did not feel disposed to undertake, but we asked a couple of questions in regard to this wharf at Becancour. My hon. friend knows that we found out that this wharf was being built to accommodate

Mr. ROCHE.

the Delaware & Hudson railway. I asked who had petitioned for this wharf, and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) told me that it had been asked for by the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows the country well enough to know that at Three Rivers we have three of our own railways, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway and the Transcontinental railway, built by ourselves, the others having been largely subsidized by the country. It is in order to permit the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company to get the wood of the Three Rivers district across the St. Lawrence, put it on its cars and take it to the United States, probably pulp wood, that this wharf is being built. In reality we are building the wharf to accommodate an American railway which is depriving these three railways at Three Rivers of their wood freight. I just submit to my hon. friend whether this is a carefully considered and wise policy. My hon. friend the Postmaster General—I do not say it to blame him at all—is one of the directors, I believe, in Canada of the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company. I give that as an instance of how far we might go in our criticism if we brought the same examination to bear on each one of these items. I have no desire to delay the minister, in fact, my desire is to abridge what concerns my own province of Quebec, not only for the reason I gave my hon. friend, but my hon. friend knows that there are very few of us from Quebec here to-night; in fact, I feel like one who treads alone a banquet hall deserted, because, apart from the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Dorchester—

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend argued very strongly against an item he might persuade me.

Mr. MONK. I do not like, in the absence of these gentlemen, to criticise items that they have obtained the insertion of in the budget. Since I have been a member of this House I have tried hard, but in spite of every effort I have never succeeded in getting an item into the estimates of the department of my hon. friend, and I am therefore in a very different position from those who can get items in without even having the trouble to be present to explain them. This manner of criticising the estimates is a most unsatisfactory one, and I had hoped that the committee to amend the rules of the House would have given us an opportunity this year of suggesting some change in the way of proceeding with the estimates. I do not believe there is an assembly voting Supply in any part of the world where estimates are put through in this way. There is no such method adopted in any other deliberative and legislative assembly. If I did what I suppose we