

money grants on the same sheet of paper the Government had presented them separately, then it would be evident that the Senate would have the right to reject any of those bills. Would the Senate lose its right by the accident of coupling them together or by the action of the Government in putting the subjects of those different bills into one—that is, on a single piece of paper which might deprive the Senate of its right? I do not think it. What I propose is to strike out the whole money grant of that railway and then it amounts to the rejection of the whole bill which would be proposed to give a money grant to this company. That is not contrary to the doctrine which has been mentioned by the Speaker. I respectfully suggest that my amendment is in order.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think that this motion is also out of order. The provision is one that is covered by the language of the first clause. The first clause is the language of the grant:—that the Governor-in-Council may grant the subsidies hereinafter granted. To strike out one limb of the grant is as much an alteration of the bill as the amendment which the hon. member from Halifax proposed a moment ago. He proposed, not to strike out the whole limb of the grant, but a portion of a limb and to change the application of the money if the engineer should so report. This amendment proposes, not to take out a part of a limb, but to take out the whole limb and, therefore, to alter to a still larger extent the provision of the bill itself. The proposition is that all the provisions of this grant contained in the first section for the purpose of making a short line railway be stricken out. Of course that is an alteration in the bill and defeats the object of the House of Commons in giving their sanction to this measure and in making the grant—one grant for all the purposes mentioned in the first and second sub-section—and if you strike out that sub-section you strike out one of the material objects the House of Commons had in view in making the grant.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—It seems to me that the reasons given by the hon. gentleman from DeSalaberry are

good and logical, but the facts are against him. In the Australian Assembly they tacked to the Subsidy Bill a clause to pay certain employes. The Legislative Council had no option but to reject the whole bill. If my hon. friend's reasoning were sound, the action of the Legislative Council would have been sustained in that instance, but when the case was carried to England it was decided otherwise. It was the subject of a long correspondence, and the result was to show that the Upper House had no power to amend; it could only accept or reject the Bill as a whole.

THE SPEAKER—I must say that the same process of reasoning which the hon. member for DeSalaberry has just now presented to the House has been revolving in my own mind, and that I entertained some doubt as to whether the House might not have the power of striking out an independent section of a bill which, of itself, might have constituted a separate and independent bill, and which would leave the bill, after it was struck out, a perfect bill with regard to the subjects which it controls; and a further reason why my mind was somewhat in doubt on that point was that the Government by a system of tacking on, which has been alluded to, might introduce and pass an obnoxious grant through Parliament in connection with one that had the general support of Parliament. But on mature reflection I have come to the conclusion arrived at by the hon. member from Montarville. I consider this is a money bill which you cannot alter, and if it contains any obnoxious feature the only means by which this House can assert its right to deal with such a feature is by rejecting the Bill as a whole.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I move in amendment:—

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the same by adding at the end of the second sub-section of the first section:—

“The above second sub-section shall be suspended until after a thorough survey of the road mentioned in the second sub-section shall have been made and put before Parliament.”