

Mr. PERLEY moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting their honours to unite with this House in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses for the purpose of considering what further steps should be taken, and what suggestions can be made in the direction of the suppression of tuberculosis in Canada, with power to send for persons papers and records, and to report from time to time, and informing them that Messrs. Barr, Béland, Black, Cash, Chisholm, Daniel, Dugas, Gordon, Hughes (Prince Edward Island), Johnston (Lambton), Lawrence, Loggie, Miller, Paquet, Parmelee, Roche (Marquette), Schaffner, Schell (Oxford), Smith (Nanaimo), Thompson and the mover, will act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of said joint committee, should the Senate agree to its creation.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

VANCOUVER, VICTORIA AND EASTERN RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 139) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Mr. BARKER. I understood there was an arrangement between the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that this Bill was not to go on to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is an error; I never heard of it.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is absent, and he has an amendment which he desires to move. I understood that the Bill was to stand over.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has given notice of an amendment. But my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) states that he understands that an arrangement has been made between the leader of the opposition and myself with regard to the Bill. There is no such arrangement. The leader of the opposition never mentioned the matter.

Mr. BARKER. I was informed that there was an understanding in some way that the Bill was not to go on to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know nothing of it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It may have arisen out of a note sent to me by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), stating, as I understood, that he would be absent on Wednesday. But I understood the Bill was to come on to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. There seems to be a misunderstanding; for the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) told me that the Bill would not come up until Wednes-

day because of his absence on Monday. I made no inquiry, but I understood from what he said that he had an arrangement made. He was going to move an amendment, and I understood the Bill was not coming up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say what the hon. member for North Toronto had in his mind. But, so far as I am concerned, not one word has been spoken to me on the subject of having the Bill postponed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not say that the member for North Toronto had an arrangement with the Prime Minister—I do not know with whom he had the arrangement or understanding; but he certainly understood clearly that the Bill would not come up to-day. That is all I know about it. There seems to have been a misunderstanding; and, if the government, on account of there having been a misunderstanding, could allow the Bill to stand over, I think it would be very well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If it were government business, we would certainly have no objection in agreeing to have the matter stand over to a convenient day. But this is not government business, and it is for the promoter to say what should be done.

Mr. D. ROSS. This is the first I have heard of any arrangement made to postpone the Bill until Wednesday. A number of supporters of the Bill have remained over purposely to be here when the Bill should come up to-day. And, as this is a private members' day, I do not see how we can postpone the consideration of the Bill until Wednesday next.

Mr. TISDALE. I saw it stated in the newspapers that, when this Bill was last before the committee, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) stated that he had an amendment which he would move when the Bill came up for consideration again.

Mr. BUREAU. Why is he not here?

Mr. TISDALE. I am not dealing with his not being here. I am dealing with the question of what the government are going to do about it. And also I am asking for information as to the correctness of certain newspaper reports which I have read. According to the newspapers the hon. member for North Toronto stated that he would postpone the motion he proposed to move in order to ascertain—as I understood—what the amendment was which the government proposed to move.

The amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) may be met by the promised announcement of the government with regard to their policy on this Bill. It is quite certain that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) intended to move his amendment un-