

way scheme; is it for the purpose of granting greater security to those who are asked to lend their money upon the securities offered by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company? I have heard it hinted that one or two of the great bankers in Europe have declined to advance more moneys, first the Rothschilds, and next another firm, and now the company have reverted to their own financiers the Barings, and they say it is impossible to raise money on the securities at present with only a 3 per cent guarantee on the part of the government. Is that correct? Or if that is not correct, has objection been taken to the purchase of these bonds on account of these words being in the Act? Is it the one reason or the other mentioned in the rumours current in the press and in the lobbies? Or perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us the purport of the Bill which has been foreshadowed by the Minister of Finance in the lower House? I fail to see in the newspaper reports that he has given any explanation of the Bill he has introduced. This gives an apparent confirmation of the rumours which have been in circulation, and is it in order to prevent the possibility of a collapse of the undertaking that my hon. friend has introduced this Bill? Having put these questions to the hon. Secretary of State, let me turn my attention to the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Does my hon. friend want an answer to his questions?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Certainly.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No. This has no possible connection with any legislation proposed in the other House. My attention was never drawn to it, except when the hon. gentleman introduced the Bill here, and I have spoken entirely from my own judgment as to what was proper between the mortgagee and the mortgagor, applying the general principle of the law. I did not hear of any cases; I have not examined. There are lots of mortgages in the Secretary of State office, but I only took up one before coming out to see what it covered, and it covers everything.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—A mortgage on what?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—On a railway—bonds or debentures issued by a railway. They are secured by a mortgage, and they have to file an original of it in the Secretary of State's office. Before coming out, I just called for one of the mortgages—I do not recollect the date of it—and I saw that this particular mortgage that I looked at covered everything, so that lawyers drawing up such a document, whether the law warranted it or not would put in everything.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It could not cover more than the Act calls for.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, but the lawyers inserted everything. I have not read the Bill introduced by the Minister of Finance, but I think it refers to changing the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It has no reference to this legislation.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I can readily understand now, from the explanation of the hon. gentleman, and his utterances a few moments ago, that when he took charge of the railway Bill he knew nothing about it. It is not the first time that that has occurred in this House. The very principle on which they carry on the government leaves a minister—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—This Bill has not been before the government. I had no cognizance of it until I saw it moved here.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—You govern the country on the one man principle. Most people understand that our system of government is joint responsibility on the part of every member of the government. No single member of the government can be held responsible for what takes place; the combination which forms the government is equally responsible. I am not going to deal with that question now. I have done so often in the past and have shown the impropriety of attempting to govern the country upon the principle which has prevailed for some time past. It being six o'clock I move the adjournment of the debate.