

There is the further feature which has to receive serious consideration at the hands of the Parliament of Canada, namely the maintenance indirectly and sentimentally of the credit of the Grand Trunk railway. It may be said that we are in no sense responsible for the obligations which that company may have entered into in connection with the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway; but we cannot overlook the fact that in a great undertaking such as the oldest transportation system of the Dominion, a transportation system favourably known throughout the world, the people of Canada must necessarily be deeply interested that its obligations should in no way handicap it in such a way as to destroy its public usefulness. With this short review of the Bill I submit it for your consideration to its second reading.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—At this late hour of the session it is a very difficult matter to discuss the important question of the Supply Bill when it is an ordinary Supply Bill, but the Supply Bill which has been brought down to-day, if it is to be adopted as a precedent, is going to place the Senate in a very peculiar position. The hon. leader of the Government, in the remarks he has made to this Chamber, has directed his attention entirely to the question of the loans to these two railways, I wish to enter, at this stage, a very strong protest against including these loans in the Supply Bill. The Supply Bill is brought down, as the hon. gentleman stated, in different schedules, but these loans to the railways and other heads and supplies to the Government are all included in the schedule (c) of the Bill, with the result that if this Chamber felt disposed to take any action with regard to these loans, they would be placed in the position of having practically to throw out the whole of that schedule of the Supply Bill. I want, for a few minutes, to direct the attention of the House to the position we are in with regard to this matter. Rule 71 of the Senate says:

To annex any clause to a Bill of aid or supply, the matter of which is foreign to, and different from the matter of the Bill, is unparliamentary.

I contend that the question of loaning money to a railway which is not included in the works of the Dominion of Canada that the Government has to supply money to carry on, should not be dealt with in the Supply Bill. I also desire to quote the words of May in regard to the possible

action which might be taken by the Senate in dealing with the matter. At page 584 May says:

Rejection by the Lords of provisions creating a charge—The right of the Lords to reject a money bill has been held to include a right to omit provisions creating charges upon the people, when such provisions form a separate subject in a bill which the Lords are otherwise entitled to amend. The claim of privilege cannot, therefore, be raised by the Commons regarding amendments to such bills, whereby a whole clause, or series of clauses, has been omitted by the Lords, which, though relating to a charge, and not admitting of amendment, yet concerned a subject separable from the general objects of the bill.

This is the point I wish particularly to draw attention to. On page 585, May says:

On the 30th July, 1867, it was very clearly put by Earl Grey and Viscount Eversley, that the right of the Lords to omit a clause, which they were unable to amend, relating to a separate subject, was equivalent to their right to reject a Bill which they could not amend without an infraction of the privileges of the Commons.

I contend that if the Government in the future is going to follow the policy that they have pursued on this particular occasion with regard to these loans, it will be for this Chamber to consider whether they will take action to bring this question to an issue. I think it is not showing due consideration to the Senate to put this question of loans before the House as it has been put by the Government. I therefore desire to enter a very strong protest against the way this matter has been brought up. It puts us in this position, that we are now, in the very dying hours of the session, called upon to consider this very important measure dealing with loans to these railway companies. The hon. gentleman, in discussing the advance to the Canadian Northern railway, stated that this money is simply a loan. I understand that it is a demand loan, that therefore it will be a loan that will place the Government in the position that they can call it up at any time, and it gives them complete control over the situation. If the Government felt obliged to make this loan, that probably was the best way they could make it. Then I find that this \$15,000,000 which we are called upon to loan to the Canadian Northern Railway is for the purpose of enabling them to get over their pressing liabilities at the present time. The figures given by the Minister of Finance the other day in another place showed that the net earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway for this year ending the 30th June, 1916, were estimated to amount