

that it has excited the jealousy and envy of the United States railways, and they have almost threatened to annihilate the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am in hopes that if we get this direct line, as I think we shall, the trade will develop as largely with Australia as it has with Japan.

The Bill passed through its final stages under a suspension of the rules.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY COMPANY'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY, from the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbours, reported Bill (71) "An Act respecting the Drummond County Railway" without amendment.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN moved the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—This Bill comes before us under such peculiar circumstances that I feel bound to do anything which I can to show the House that it ought not to pass. I rise to a question of order as to the report of that Committee. If I read the rule correctly, it provides that in the case of a Bill from the House of Commons, notice must be given at least twenty-four hours before the Committee meets. Now, twenty-four hours means a day, and it has been customary for the past twenty-five years to give notice of Monday for Wednesday; that is one clear day. What is the object of that? You must go into the object of the rules to get at the meaning of them. Ru'e 61 says that if the Bill originates in the Senate, one week's notice must be given. Why? So as to give the parties who are interested time to reach the seat of Government and oppose or support the Bill. The rule adds that in case a Bill has gone through the other House it shall not be necessary to give a week's notice, because the parties are advised and informed, and are in a position to reach the seat of Government if they desire to do so. That is the evident object of the rule. Now, has that object been accomplished in this case? The Bill was read last night about 9.30.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—It was read before nine o'clock.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—Then say 8.30. All the mails had gone except the North

west mails. How could you inform those parties that the Bill would come up to-night at 9.00 or 9.30? Surely you could not. Then has the object of this rule been complied with? Not at all. That shows that the object of the rule was to give ample notice to interested parties to appear before the Committee. Otherwise why could not the Committee have sat last night immediately after we adjourned, and passed the Bill? The parties could not reach Ottawa in time. I have explained the object of the rule, and I say that the practice of the House is in favour of that interpretation. The Committee has never been summoned except after one clear day's notice. I am sure there is not a gentleman in this House who can cite a case where such a thing as is now attempted has been done. It is an innovation, and under what circumstances? I shall have occasion to speak of the circumstances probably by and by. If I were to do so now I would be called to order, and I confine my remarks to the question of order. If we look to the authorities, what do we find? In such cases in England, a clear day's notice is required. This again shows the intention of our rule. Then if this is so, why should we sanction an innovation and act upon an interpretation which evidently is not in accord with the intention of the rule? I object to the report of the Committee as being quite against the rules of this House.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman from DeLanaudière, as a rule, has very clear views upon questions of order. I have heard him many times with a great deal of pleasure, but I do not think I have ever listened to him with more surprise than on the present occasion. Last evening when this Bill was being considered, it was contended that the twenty-four hours meant a day. It was used as an argument by the opponents of the Bill. I do not just know whether the hon. gentleman spoke upon that question, but others who agreed with him in opposing the Bill contended that twenty-four hours meant twenty-four hours, and His Honour the Speaker took that ground. Although I had argued as well as I could in the other direction, I had to admit, as I have freely admitted since, and I think all the friends of the Bill have admitted it, that the decision of His Honour the Speaker was right, and that when the rule said twenty-four hours, it