

printed on the same page as the corresponding clauses of the Act itself. We had a Bill printed in that way before, with the proposed alterations in italics. I think that for the purpose of the work of this House that would be a much more convenient and useful way of having it done. I do not know whether it is now too late to get that done or not, but, if it is not too late, I would suggest to my honourable friend that the alterations should be shown in that way.

With regard to the question of considering this measure in Committee of the Whole House, I think if we are going to dispose of it this session it is the most reasonable and satisfactory way of dealing with it. The Railway Committee heard last session, I think, all those who were interested in the different clauses of the Bill and who wished to be heard. They laid their cases very fully before the committee. I think we shall do much better by considering the present Bill in Committee of the Whole House rather than by referring it to the Standing Committee on Railways.

Hon. J. P. B. CASGRAIN: Honourable gentlemen, I want to commend and congratulate the honourable leader of the Government for at last coming around to my way of thinking. I have always advocated that public Bills should be considered in Committee of the Whole House, and have always deprecated the habit that has been followed in this House for the last ten or twelve years of sending public Bills to standing committees where they are considered by the members of the respective committees, but where other members are rather diffident about attending, although they have a perfect right to do so. As a rule, they do not attend, and the Bill is dealt with by a quorum of the committee, and then is railroaded through this House without the members of the Senate generally having an opportunity of studying it. I think it essential that public measures should be dealt with in this House. The standing committees were created for the purpose of dealing with private Bills; but when I entered the House, about eighteen years ago, public Bills were invariably referred to the Committee of the Whole. I am glad to observe that the Government is now coming back to the proper method. I suppose, now that the Government is well entrenched, with numerous followers, it is inclined to make a good display of its strength. With its big majority it is perfectly safe, and it feels perhaps that this matter can be dealt with more easily in Committee of the Whole House.

S—4

However, I would point out to the Government that there may be a few questions upon which certain persons who would be able to adduce some new evidence might like to be heard. Perhaps there may be something in the Bill not exactly on all fours with the Bill which we had last year. In the olden days, when public Bills were introduced, members were written to by persons affected by the proposed legislation, and their suggestions were submitted in this House, with a view to having changes introduced or certain provisions taken out. I think, however, that provision should be made for hearing parties who, like the public, are very much interested—such companies, for instance, as the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern, which is now between heaven and earth. We bought it last year, but we have not possession of it yet, and the arbitration is still going on. Or it may be that the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific would want to have their counsel heard. I would be, as I have stated, very much in favour of having the Bill considered by the Committee of the Whole, but would ask that the Government consider the advisability of referring particular points to some committee, say the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbours, if counsel desired to be heard as to certain points. Apart from such references, the Bill can be dealt with much more quickly in Committee of the Whole House than by a standing committee, which would meet at half-past ten o'clock and adjourn at one, whereas the House meets at two or three o'clock in the afternoon and can meet again in the evening if necessary.

With reference to the suggestion made by the honourable leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Bostock), the honourable leader of the Government will remember that when—in 1903, I think—the first Consolidated Railway Bill was introduced, the existing Act was printed on one page and the proposed changes on the opposite page, a number of blank spaces being left upon which senators could insert any amendments. That was a very convenient way. The consolidated Bill of that time was not as large a measure as the present one, but it was fully considered by the Senate. I think matters would be expedited if the Government would adopt the idea of having the existing clauses printed with the proposed new clauses. Once more, before taking my seat, I commend the Government for having come around to my way of thinking.