

Chester in the east to Yarmouth in the west we have a line skirting the coast pretty well. Now I take it the government has information as to what points fresh fish is loaded on that railway, which skirts the sea as it does, and how many cars are loaded at the different points. There is another thing which we should also consider in connection with this matter. There is a line of boats; in fact, there is more than one line of boats; there is a boat service which is now subsidized and which is supposed to be looking after this fish business. I think the government ought to have and to bring down information as to the amount of subsidies paid. It is quite obvious that there might be a saving by passing this bill and striking out the subsidy.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall have a note made of the requests which my hon. friend has made and see that we get that information down. Before we ask that the bill be considered, I will try to get everything possible.

Mr. CLARK: Will the amounts to be paid under these bills and the amounts to be spent each year be put in the estimates every year?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have been discussing that for about an hour. They will appear just as other amounts that are voted by statute, just as in the case of the other acts which I have cited, not for discussion, but for record.

Mr. CLARK: In the estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think so. I am not sure about that until I discuss with the auditors the best methods. We are only beating around the bush. Parliament will have all the information necessary as regards the expenditure of this or any vote.

Mr. BOYS: The minister says that they will not be subject to discussion because they will be authorized by statute. What chance have we for discussion?

Mr. GRAHAM: The same chance as was the case in connection with the highways bill.

Mr. BOYS: That is a *tu quoque* argument. Get away from that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last year the highways were discussed for half a day and there were no estimates at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The highways?

Mr. GRAHAM: The salaries were in for the officers, but the grant to highways was by statute. Yet we discussed everything in connection with the highways, under the amount of money for the railways of Canada, a portion

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

of which goes to the salaries of the staff. Under that every act of that board came under the purview of this parliament for full discussion.

Mr. BOYS: That is not the point. The point I am raising is: Are we going to have an opportunity to discuss these appropriations in future years?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

Mr. BOYS: Under what item shall we have that opportunity? The minister has said that the items will appear in the estimates, as authorized by statute, but not for discussion. If he means that, what chance shall we have for discussion?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is taking me literally. I said that items that are authorized by statute are not discussable as regards those particular items *per se*, if he will allow me to use that language of his. But, as a matter of fact, under the heading of Railway Estimates, everything that the railway board does or intends to do can be fully discussed. That will include these.

Mr. BOYS: I appreciate that that will be the case in a general way, but we would have no control of the expenditure, once this goes through. That is the vital point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to draw the minister's attention to this very great difference. When you vote money to be spent year after year, especially under the supervision of another parliament, you place a limit on the amount that is to be spent, so that we know every year there cannot be more than a certain amount spent. The minister never can know that under this bill and he will have no way of knowing it. I do not know how he is even to get anything in the estimates to look at. How is he going to know? No limit is set upon the expenditure. They may spend the whole amount in one year, and if the bill is like what it was last year, they can spend twice as much, because the bill last year had no fixed, definite or final limitation. The bill may be different this year, but they can spend the whole thing in one year in any case.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may not be physically possible, but there is no parliamentary restraint. That is wholly different from a policy that contemplates a fixed maximum each year, especially when the matter is something that is controlled by another parliament. You could not get a more distinct case of absolutely putting out of the control of parliament what parliament