

Mr. TURRIFF. The Bill was called earlier than I expected in the Railway Committee so that I was not present, and clause 3 was struck out under the misapprehension that proper notice had not been given. The advertisement in the newspaper was wrong in the first issue, but it was set right in subsequent issues, and clause 3 was rejected on the mistaken ground that it had not been properly advertised.

Mr. BERGERON. If that is the only amendment you need, it can be done in this committee with the consent of the whole.

Mr. TURRIFF. I should be very glad of that.

Mr. HENDERSON. It was intimated in the committee that no notice or not sufficient notice had been given of this clause, and for that reason the committee very properly decided to expunge the clause. A short time ago the right hon. leader of the House stated that we should pay a good deal of attention to a report of the Railway Committee, and I ask that the advice of the Prime Minister be taken in this case. We did pay attention to it in regard to another Bill in which unfortunately an error was made. A resolution which I moved in the Railway Committee with regard to the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway was declared defeated, but it was defeated by the vote of an hon. member of the House who was not a member of the committee, and I am sorry to say that he was one of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues. Therefore, we cannot always depend on the reports of the Railway Committee. But in this case I feel quite satisfied that the report of the Railway Committee voices the sentiment of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the motion is that I do now leave the chair.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. member tell us what he wants to do?

Mr. TURRIFF. The Bill came to this House from the Senate. It was taken up by the Railway Committee at the last meeting earlier than I expected, and I was not present; but I understand that clause 3 was struck out on the ground that proper notice had not been given. I want clause 3 re-inserted.

Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand that the hon. member can show that proper notice was given?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am informed by the senator who had charge of the Bill in the Senate that it was.

Mr. HENDERSON. The clause was struck out in the Railway Committee because we were informed there that the no-

tice was insufficient, and we thought it would be unfair to put in a clause authorizing the construction of a railway through a section of country in which, I have no doubt, numerous other railway companies are chartered to construct railways without notice that this clause was proposed in this charter. The lack of notice was the only reason why it was struck out.

Mr. BERGERON. If that was the only reason, I do not think it was proper. The question of notice is a question for the Committee on Standing Orders; we have nothing to do with that here. That was a question to be settled by the Senate when the Bill came up there. If we struck the clause out on that ground, we might become involved in one of those discussions between the House of Commons and the Senate that should be avoided. If that is the only reason why the clause was expunged, I think we should allow it to be re-inserted.

Mr. TISDALE. We must not forget that this Bill was passed by the Senate, and we must assume that they looked properly into the question of notices. The question is a question of fact. If the promoter of the Bill cannot inform us of the facts to-day, I think we should allow the Bill to stand till Wednesday, so that the hon. gentleman could inquire into them in the meantime.

Mr. GRANT. I think I can throw some light on this matter. I am informed by the Clerk of the Standing Orders Committee of the Senate that they looked thoroughly into the question and found the notices to be sufficient. It may be true that the original notice was insufficient, but I am informed that it is now all right. In my judgment, the clause was struck out by the Railway Committee in error.

Mr. BERGERON. On reference to the report of the Standing Orders Committee, I find that this Bill was reported on by that committee on the 23rd of June, and that the notices were stated to be correct. As my hon. friend from Halton states that that was the only reason why clause 3 was expunged, I believe it would be our duty to comply with the request of the promoter of the Bill and re-insert that clause.

Mr. TURRIFF moved that section 3 be restored.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it covered by the petition?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. This clause gives power to construct a railway, and we ought to proceed carefully. I am inclined to think that the prudent way would be to refer the Bill back to the Railway Committee. This can only be done without notice by unanimous consent. We should avoid falling into loose methods of doing business, and I do not think it would endanger the Bill to refer