

## After Recess.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BAKER. I rise to a question of privilege, for the purpose of enabling me to set right a little matter which occurred before you left the Chair, at six o'clock. When I moved the adjournment of the debate, my intention was to have it come on after six o'clock, and it was my ignorance of Parliamentary proceedings which led me into the guiltiness, if I may so call it, of a *lapsus lingue*. I really intended the debate to go on when I made that motion, and inasmuch as I am supporting the motion brought in by my colleague, I think it is due to him and to my constituency that I should make this explanation. I trust to the generosity of the House on this occasion, to correct the error which I made, by allowing the order to remain where it should have appeared on the Orders of the Day as if I had not made the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only way, I think, in which the hon. gentleman can do that, is with the consent of the House, to move to rescind the order that the debate be adjourned; and the only difference it would make is this, that when a debate is in progress when six o'clock arrives, and I leave the Chair, the question is then put at the top of the Public Bills and Orders, and is no longer a notice of motion. But if the debate is adjourned, it goes to the bottom of Public Bills and Orders. By moving that the order be rescinded, it will go to the head of the Public Bills and Orders, and would come on next Wednesday evening.

Mr. BAKER. With the permission of the House, I would then move that it be rescinded.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better that the hon. gentleman should make his motion at some other time. What will happen, if the motion be rescinded now? How will the debate stand adjourned?

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be the same as at six o'clock.

Mr. BLAKE. But it is past six o'clock; it is eight o'clock.

Mr. BAKER. I have no doubt that it makes very little difference in the result, but it makes a good deal of difference to me. I wish to explain to the House that I have committed an error through want of knowledge of Parliamentary practice.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think any person desires to prevent the hon. gentleman having his error rectified—at any rate, I shall be glad to help him, if possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the debate had dropped at six o'clock, I suppose the order would have kept its place.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would have been higher on the paper.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest as a more regular way—and I do not think that the House would object, for it is an important question, which I agree should be fully debated—that the Government should give notice to have this order stand at the head of this class of orders. For my part, I would be willing to assent to such a motion, and then the hon. gentleman's error would be remedied.

## HAMILTON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

On the order being called for the House to resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company being read,

Mr. MULOCK. Before the motion is adopted, I wish to call the attention of the House to an amendment which I have placed on the paper, and which I intend to move.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should move it in Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware that we are to go into Committee; but before we do so, I think it is regular for me to make some observations to which I wish to direct the attention of the Government especially. I think there has been an oversight in the manner in which this Bill has been dealt with by the Committee, and it should either go back to the Railway Committee, to be corrected, or it should be corrected here; and I think the Government must take the responsibility, in the end, of seeing that this Bill issues in a manner to the public interest. I do not say that the Government is in the slightest degree to blame, but I wish to fully acquaint the Government and the House with the interests involved.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that if he is going to raise important questions on this Bill, it would be better, and I would ask my hon. friend in charge of the Bill to consent, that it should be referred back to the Railway Committee, where it can be examined and considered. It is not usual, after a Bill has passed that Committee by consent, to raise important questions here, and I think it would be more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways and Canals, for the further consideration of those points which have been overlooked.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite agreeable to the course suggested but, inasmuch as the remarks I wish to make apply both to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway and to the Northern Railway, perhaps the mover of the Northern Railway Bill will agree to the same course.

Mr. SMALL. I have no objection.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I move that the Bill be referred back.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways. When an important Bill, such as this is, likely to involve an important debate upon the effect of certain clauses, I think it is very desirable that it should be relegated back to the Committee to have the matter discussed there. I only regret that the same course was not pursued with regard to the Grand Trunk Bill. However, circumstances alter cases, a little, it appears. I do not object to the motion of the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

## GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Curran's proposed motion: That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 21) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will be in the recollection of the House that a question was raised by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron) in regard to the legality of the amalgamation which had taken place between the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways; and my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) intimated that it was upon the assurance I had given to the Committee, that the Minister of Justice had very carefully considered that point, that the Bill had passed through Committee without very much investigation in that regard; and he suggested that the Bill should stand over, a suggestion to which weight was given by the objections raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The Bill was consequently allowed to stand over. Now, I desire to say to the House that I have called the attention of the Minister of Justice again to that point, and he has given a very careful and thorough re-examination of the question; and, in the light of the act which my hon.