

to it, and they want the question left to the country. It is not left to the electorate at all because in making what he calls a fair division the Prime Minister brings in the question of policy and gives to two constituencies which by their population are not entitled to a third of a member, two members. That is the position. The hon. gentleman to be fair and to be right, should follow the principles adopted in every other English speaking country in the world: in the United States, in New Zealand, in Natal, in New South Wales. He should follow the principles adopted in Great Britain, that is to remove it from the area of pure party politics altogether. They are big enough in every other place to leave these questions to an independent tribunal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did the hon. gentleman follow that policy?

Mr. HAGGART. The first to propose this policy was Mr. Gladstone—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did you follow it?

Mr. HAGGART. The party who proposed that policy in the House and advocated it again and again, were the leaders of the hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, Mr. Blake, and Mr. Mills. The policy was endorsed, was inscribed in an Act of parliament introduced by the present Postmaster General. It has always been the policy of the Reform party to adopt this principle, but it is like the other promises made and many of them made by the present government from end to end of the country, it was all talk and when they had the power to perform it they were led by political reasons in order to get a little political advantage, in a small manner, in one section of the country, to swallow their principles and adopt others when the opportunity offered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did you adopt it, when you divided the constituencies?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. L. G. MCCARTHY moved the third reading of Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I was present when this Bill was before the Railway Committee, but was not in my place the other evening when it was discussed in the Committee of the Whole. I believe that on the latter occasion some remarks were made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I had hoped that he would be here to-night, because I wished to ask him some questions about the changes that have been made by

the forms of agreement in the Bill, which, in effect, amend and alter the Acts passed last session. I do not know whether it is desirable to go on at the present moment, or whether we may expect that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will be soon in his place. But I am prepared to state the question I raised before the Railway Committee, and perhaps the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be able to tell us exactly what the effect of the change is. In the Act passed last session provision was made for the issue of interim bonds by the railway company, which bonds were to be guaranteed by the government, and, in the event of such bonds being issued, provision was made for their retirement and the substitution for them of permanent bonds. It was found—and I think very probably it was correctly found—that the interim bonds would not serve the purpose. I never thought it was a very happy expedient, and I think the company are quite right in coming to the conclusion that interim bonds would have been a mistake. But the question I raised in the Railway Committee was this: The original contract was drawn with the view to the issue of these interim bonds, which, at the conclusion of the work, would be replaced by permanent bonds; and when that substitution should take place there would necessarily be an adjustment of the whole construction account. Therefore, the government would know, at the end, precisely the amount to which its guarantee applies. It will be evident to any person at all acquainted with such matters that there is always some risk in issuing, on progress estimates, interim bonds, as the amount may far exceed the value of the work as finally ascertained. As I say, I pointed this out in the Railway Committee to the Minister of Justice and in the presence of the counsel for the railway company. It was not disputed. I pointed out that it was almost impossible to avoid some risk in this respect, because the chief engineer of the work was absolutely dependent upon his subordinates for the progress report. A young gentleman with very little experience might have charge of ten miles of some very important portion of the work. He, of course, would send in his estimates month by month, and the chief engineer would have to make up his accounts on the basis of these reports. With every desire on the part of each person concerned to be absolutely correct and honest, errors might creep in from time to time. These, of course, would be repaired on the final adjustment. There would be no trouble in this under the Act we passed a year ago, because, whatever the interim bonds might be, the permanent bonds would not issue until the account was finally made up.

But, finding it inconvenient to issue interim bonds, the solicitors drawing these forms agreed that permanent bonds