

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is open to the same objection.

THE SPEAKER—Yes, I consider it also open to the same objection, and is not in order.

HON. MR. POWER moved in amendment :—

“That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of adding the following sub-clause to the first clause :—

“(3.) The work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the work on the portions of the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine.”

The reason I think it desirable to move that sub-clause is that that particular link in the proposed line of railway is the one which is most essential to the lower provinces—I mean to Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and a portion of New Brunswick. Without that link the short line is of no value whatever to that part of the country, and there is another reason why it is most desirable that work should be prosecuted on that link at once. This Bill contains a provision for a subsidy for a railway from Riviere DuLoup or Riviere Ouelle to Edmonston—that is the short line from Quebec to the lower provinces. That road is of no value to the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia unless the link to which reference is made in my amendment forms part of the road. It does not matter what line is chosen for the short line, that particular link from Fredericton to Salisbury will form part of it, and work should be gone on with upon it at once. Now, I do not think that this amendment stands in exactly the same position as those which have been ruled out of order. In the first place, there is nothing in it inconsistent with the Bill; it can stand with the Bill: it does not propose to alter its provisions.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—It stands in the same position as the others.

HON. MR. POWER—I may mention a circumstance in connection with it which shows that at any rate in the esti-

mation of the authorities of the House of Commons it did not stand in the same position as the other amendments. This amendment was moved at the third reading of the Bill in the House of Commons. It was moved originally as an amendment to the resolution, and then afterwards at the third reading of the Bill; and no objection whatever was taken to it on the ground that it was out of order.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The House of Commons was dealing with its own Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—The ground that the leader of the Government took with respect to the other amendment which I moved was that it could not be made in the House of Commons without a resolution, but this one was moved in amendment to the Bill.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It had previously been moved in amendment of the resolution.

HON. MR. POWER—It does not alter the essence of the Bill before us in any way. It does not affect the amount of money to be spent, and it can stand with the Bill as it is now; and I think it is a case, at any rate, where the rule should be construed liberally. We have been in the habit heretofore of making amendments in bills which provided for the expenditure of money. We have made amendments to Bills relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other measures of that sort where money grants were involved.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I am afraid we are going too far in the sense of abdicating the rights and powers of this House, and especially in the direction, perhaps, in which the whole world is going. It has been remarked very often by what I might call leading men—the superior minds in England—that British institutions were being so rapidly disfigured that England is not far from the time when the British constitution will exist no more. The principle of the constitution is perfect equality of power between the three branches of parliament, and we are every