

and that is to examine and report upon all that appertains to the commercial character of the transactions that are authorized to be carried on by the Bill. I submit that even if we have been following a bad precedent it is time we should make a change. To my mind this Bill goes so very far along the line that I have indicated that it would be well to have it referred to the Private Bills Committee to give us their opinion. There are supposed to be men on that committee who are experts in these matters. Men are selected on these committees as I understand by reason of their knowledge of various transactions. A man may be put on the Railway Committee because he has some knowledge of the construction of railways. A man is put on the Committee on Banking and Commerce presumably because he has some technical knowledge of the matters that will come before that committee. It is the same in regard to the Private Bills Committee; men are put on that committee who have had experience for the last twenty-five years, possibly many of them, or for years and years, in dealing with matters of this kind and their opinion would be of very much more importance than that of a committee that has never been charged with the consideration of transactions of this kind. If we have been making a mistake in the past by all means let us make a change and lay down a new principle. If that Bill is not referred to Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee, and if it comes up in the House again I shall take a decided stand against its progress until a reference has been made and a report brought down from that committee approving of it. That is only reasonable and I am quite sure we will be supported by many members on that line.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought there was some rule of the kind I suggested. I find rule 101 of the House reads:

Before any private Bill is considered by the committee to which it may be referred, a report shall first be submitted to the committee by the examiner, stating that he has examined the same, and has noted, opposite each section, any variations from the provisions contained in the model Bill; and to insure uniformity, the examiner shall revise and certify every private Bill passed by the committees, and the reports thereon, before they are presented to the House.

I believe the Railway Committee is the only committee which has a model Bill, and I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that he should resuscitate that much-abused and may be long-lost article and get his examiner to work on it, and pass these Bills as they come up. I presume that the examiner referred to is Mr. Hartney.

Mr. GRAHAM. He is the clerk of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. He knows the model Bill and is supposed to examine all Bills that come up. May be this rule is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. In reply to my hon. friend who has the Bill in charge, there always comes a time when you note extravagances that are going on, and we have to make a protest at this time, even although there may be examples of something almost similar. I think it would be well to hold this Bill over.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The powers granted by clause 14 seem to be very much too wide for any railway Bill. I for one desire to protest against the granting of a large number of the privileges asked for in that clause. It may be said that I should have raised this objection in the Railway Committee. That is certainly the proper place to object, but it must be remembered that the Banking and Commerce Committee has been sitting on the same day as the Railway Committee for the last two or three weeks, and being on that committee I have been attending its meetings when this Bill was before the Railway Committee. Had I been at the Railway Committee I would certainly have protested against this clause. What the minister has said with regard to the coal supply of Pennsylvania should be a lesson to us and a warning never to get into the same box. This is bound to be a great country in the near future, and this railway company, with all its powers, can do immense damage to any person or corporation operating coal fields or carrying on lumbering operations anywhere along its line. The railway company might grant great favours to their own products and discriminate against the products of any company carrying on either the coal or lumbering business. A very unfair advantage might be taken. With all deference to the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre), I cannot recall a Bill that approaches what he is asking for in this Bill. It may be there are such Bills, but I doubt if the wide range of powers proposed to be given here can be duplicated by any other Bill. He spoke of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Bill, but I do not think it contained anything like this clause, permitting the company to carry on all these operations. I think the Bill should certainly be held up until this is looked into.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difficulty here, as I think I find it in the Railway Committee, and as I found it in the Railway Committee of the Ontario legislature, is that every railway company asking for railway legislation has its solicitor look over all other Railway Acts that have been passed, and put in their Bill all they want themselves; then they add everything that any person else ever got. That is one of the difficulties. We may as well hold the Bill over for a few days and look into it more thoroughly before we go on with it.