

day diminishing the power of one or two branches and augmenting the power of the third. It will be in a short time quite a new system, and the British constitution will be destroyed. Of course I would not venture to say that, if it had not been repeated perhaps twenty times by Lord Beaconsfield, and even, long ago, by Lord Grey. I make that remark to direct the attention of the House to this point, and I think it is a very remarkable one. I think this Bill is essentially bad, and we are exerting ourselves here to save the Government from an immense responsibility. I hope even after the passing of the measure they will re-consider the matter and see whether those grants should be made.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hardly think that any further argument is necessary in order to show that this amendment is equally out of order with the others. My hon. friend says it might stand with the Bill as it now stands and is therefore not out of order. In the case I quoted it was only an amendment that the payments should be made under the provisions applicable to other payments. It was to make similar provisions to those which existed relating to the other payments, and with reference to such a point as that the House of Commons objected to.

HON. MR. POWER—This does not affect the payments ; it affects the work.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am pointing out that even a smaller change was objected to. This proposes to change the direction in which the money is to be expended ; that instead of being expended as the engineer or the Governor-in-Council may think convenient, it shall be expended *pari passu* on two roads.

HON. MR. POWER—It does not say the money shall be expended ; it says the work shall be done.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—How can the work be done without expending the money ? There is a direct interference on the part of this House with the expenditure of money which the House of Commons says shall be expended otherwise. It is a direct interference which the

House of Commons will naturally and properly resist. It seems to me the remarks made by the hon. member from DeSalaberry, if at all just, relate to matters which can only be dealt with by legislation or some change in the practice or usage of Parliament. As it is now, the law of Parliament provides what shall be done, and I do not agree with him in thinking that the practice of the last 50 years has diminished or increased the powers of the House of Lords to deal with those bills. The cases which we are still citing and which govern the action of the House of Lords and the action of the Senate are not cases of yesterday, but have grown up during 100 years and are uniform in tenor, and I do not think the House of Commons asserts for itself now so strongly and exclusively the rights we are speaking of as they did 60 or 70 years ago. This tendency to relax is shown by the fact that they allow the House of Lords to insert penalties and small provisions with reference to such matters as they formerly objected altogether to the Upper House dealing with, and with a little research I think I can show that the tendency of the House of Commons is rather to relax, so far as is consistent with common sense. They were much more jealous of their powers in former years than they are now, but still they have always adhered to the rules which direct the expenditure of money and which are based on a well known principle in the relations of the two Houses. This present amendment proposes to change the disposition which the House of Commons have made of this money and to divert it in a different direction and under different rules, and I think therefore it is out of order.

THE SPEAKER—I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what I have said with regard to the want of power of this House to alter a money Bill. I consider this would be a vital alteration in the Bill, and I may say if I had any doubt in the matter I should have given the hon. member for Halifax the benefit of the doubt, but I have none.

The main motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

At 12.30 p.m. the Senate adjourned during pleasure.