

suggest that it would be much better policy to keep a record of the proceedings. And, if the policy of secrecy were abandoned and a policy of communicating to the people what goes on from time to time adopted, it would be very much more in the public interest. This is the third error. Mr. Campbell goes on :

#### ONTARIO'S CLAIMS.

Upon the discussion of the territory to be added from the district of Keewatin both Mr. Rogers and myself were very much astonished when Sir Wilfrid made the suggestion of calling in Quebec and Ontario and I asked Sir Wilfrid if the government of Ontario had ever advanced any claim or suggested that they had any claim on the district of Keewatin, to which he replied that they had not.

That, I venture to say is an error too. I have looked at the returns brought down, I went to get them again to-day, but I understand they have gone to the printer. When the right hon. gentleman says—and I think the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) endeavoured the other day to substantiate it, that there had been no application or suggestion of claim from Ontario at that date, I venture to say that the records will prove otherwise. On page 15 of the records before the House there is a printed letter. That letter written on the 16th or the 6th,—if it was the 16th it shows the failure of memory to be all the worse—was written and, I think, signed by the Prime Minister, to Mr. Whitney saying: I inclose certain papers in reference to the application of the province of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries. There is one other clause that I will read, and it is significant in many respects. It is the fourth evidence of a very decided lapse of memory.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

#### After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

#### PRIVATE BILLS.

##### GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 45) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonald.

On the question: Shall the Bill be reported:

Mr. BARKER. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) is here, but if he is not this Bill should not proceed in his absence. It is a very important Bill, one of the most important private Bills that could be brought before this House, and I do think we ought to have the presence of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals during its discussion. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is in charge of the interests of the railway company which is promoting the Bill, but I think the government should

Mr. LENNOX.

be represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals in any discussion that occurs during its passage.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know whether the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was present on Wednesday night or not when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) was here, and when we had a very full discussion, not of the Bill before the House, but of another Bill which is now upon the order paper, relating to the government's policy, not in respect to anything contained in these particular Bills, but in respect to a totally different matter, not germane to anything contained in these Bills, but relating wholly to a proposition that the government should hereafter exercise certain rights in the way of users of this railway from Coteau to Parry Sound and on the Grand Trunk from Coteau to Montreal. The hon. gentleman will probably recall that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals then stated that upon moving in the House the Bill which he proposes to introduce to amend the Government's Railway Act all the information relative to the purport of the Bill or to the question, which I presume my hon. friend is interested in, will be given by him to the House. I presume my hon. friend desires to direct the remarks, or the criticisms, if there are criticisms, not so much to anything contained in these particular measures, but to the governmental policy relating to the users of the railways affected by them in the future. Speaking on behalf of the company—not on behalf of the company any more than that the Bill has been entrusted to me—I would like to submit to the committee and to my hon. friend from Hamilton that the discussion, if there is to be one, or the suggestions, if there are any to be made, should be such as would be pertinent purely to the propositions contained in these measures. There is no matter of government policy connected with anything contained in these particular Bills and I submit that my hon. friend will have a full opportunity to discuss the proposition mentioned by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the other night when his Bill comes on.

Mr. BARKER. I, from no fault of my own, was unable to be present on the evening of the 5th when the discussion took place that the hon. gentleman has referred to. I do not claim any privilege on that account. I only explain I was unable to be present. I was not well. I did desire to be present on that evening, not for the purpose particularly of discussing this Bill as regards the company that is seeking legislation, but because of the application of the Bill to public interests. It relates to the acquisition of a railway which the country is interested in and for that reason I take the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, on this occasion of asking that the Bill should not be