

have the change made that was agreed to in the manner that I have already suggested.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no doubt the change was made because when the question of capital was spoken of I myself said that the capital was out of all proportion to the length of the road, and the Minister of Railways suggested the reduction of capital to one million five hundred thousand dollars. Many members of the Railway Committee agreed to this and I was satisfied the change was made by the chairman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My recollection does not carry me as far as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do remember very well that it was proposed, but I do not remember that it was carried by the committee, as having been put to the committee. I remember very well that the gentleman representing the promoters said it was agreed to, and if there is any question about it I do not insist. The course proposed by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is certainly a proper course and one that would be assented to on all hands unless there is a disposition, which I am almost inclined to think exists in some quarters, to raise obstacles to the passing of the Bill.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I most suspect there is a little evidence of conflict to the Bill, but if there is not we can get rid of the question in the way suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Casey).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only way we can get rid of the difficulty is by moving that the committee rise and report progress. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) that there is no disposition to do anything but comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. HUGHES. I heartily concur in what the hon. leader of the Opposition says, and I scarcely think that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is justified in supposing that I have any desire to oppose the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I exonerate you.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as the railway is not more than thirty miles in length, running down into the United States ten or fifteen miles, and then back into Canada another ten or fifteen miles, with power to build branches in any direction they choose, I think the capital might very well be reduced. I have not the slightest objection to its being changed in the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I would draw attention to the rule :

No important amendment may be proposed to any private Bill in the Committee of the Whole House on a third reading unless one day's notice has been given.

That is the rule, what are you going to do ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Since the question is under discussion, I sent for the original Bill, and I find that in clause 6 there is no amendment at all. The clause was carried as it stood originally, with a capital of \$2,500,000 ; and on account of the divergence of opinion expressed by members of the committee, I cannot do otherwise than put the clause as it is.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the best reason why the motion of the hon. gentleman should not be carried, is that we do not know where we stand on the Bill. It was agreed by all parties in the Railway Committee that the capital mentioned in clause 6 should be reduced to \$1,000,000. The motion was made, it was agreed to in committee, and the promoters of the Bill before the committee and the interested parties as well, agreed to the amendment. There can be no question about that fact. I expect, Sir, that there exists in certain quarters a disposition to prevent the Bill from being discussed so as to enable us to give an intelligent vote on the matter. There is, therefore, some evidence of conflict to the Bill, and it is impossible, under the circumstances, to proceed any further.

This Bill was amended in the Railway Committee, and as I read clause 6 which the committee is asked to adopt, it seems to me that quite a different construction is put on it from that agreed to in the Railway Committee. Under the circumstances, and should there be no other ground than this divergence of opinions, to induce us to adopt the motion that the committee do rise. I think we ought to take that course, in order not to waste the time of the House. The promoters of the Bill would benefit by it, and they should agree to the proposition that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways.

There is still another reason why the committee of the House should not proceed now to consider this Bill, and it is that we have had before the committee such conflicting evidence, that it is impossible for the committee, as I said a little while ago, to give an intelligent vote on the matter. I think we did receive no less than a hundred telegrams and as many resolutions from all parts of the Territories. These telegrams and resolutions were in conflict with each other. I think, therefore, that it would be in the public interest, as well as in the interest of the private individuals concerned that the committee should now rise, and that the Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee, so as to allow us not only to embody in the Bill the amendment which was carried by the committee, but also in order that we might ascertain whether those resolutions sent by the Boards of Trade and the municipal councils of the North-west Territories are genuine or not,