

is a curve and full of zigzags, and therefore not the base of a triangle as described. I regret that this line has been adopted, especially from the surveys we have had. I cannot, myself, form an opinion as to the shortest line, but when you find such an eminent engineer as Mr. Shanly saying that he cannot decide which is the shortest line on the information before the country, certainly there must be some doubt as to where the best practical line is to be had.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I submit that this proposed amendment is out of order. It is out of order in two respects: it not only proposes to alter a provision which has come from the House of Commons with reference to the expenditure of money, but it proposes to make a new grant to another road, because it is substantially another road. Even if that were proposed in the House of Commons, it could not have originated except by resolution, and if it would have to go back to the beginning of the proceedings in order to be introduced in that House, much less can it be introduced in this House. The case I am about to cite to the House is much in point, and it seems to me to dispose of this completely, even if it were much nearer to the rule than it really is. The case which I mention is described in May in these words:—

“So strictly is the principle observed in all matters affecting the public revenues, that where certain payments have been directed by a Bill to be made into and out of the Consolidated Fund, the Commons have refused to permit the Lords to insert a clause providing that such payments should be made under the same regulations as were applicable by law to other similar payments.”

Showing that the House of Commons assert the exclusive jurisdiction to deal with money and how it shall be expended. They say in this Bill that the money shall be expended between such and such a place, and the amendment says that that shall not be done.

HON. MR. POWER—Oh, no.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It does, because it says the payment shall not be made on the line between such and such a point.

HON. MR. KAULBACH

HON. MR. POWER—No.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It provides that if after a survey it should be found the shortest line. There is another objection: it is not proposed to give it to any company; it is proposed to be held in air until a survey is made by an engineer so that in every respect it is out of order, and I ask if the House will sanction it, that His Honor the Speaker decide the point.

THE SPEAKER—I have no doubt that the amendment is out of order for the reasons stated by the Minister of Justice, and which I need not repeat. The amendment strikes at the vital principle of the Bill. I shall just read, in addition to the authority cited by the Minister, a paragraph from the latest work we have on Parliamentary practice—Bourinot:—

“The constitutional privileges of the Commons in this particular are now tacitly acknowledged by the Senate never attempting to amend the Supply Bill. If any alteration is now made in a money or taxation Bill in the House of Lords, it is only of a verbal and unimportant character; but even such an alteration is of very unusual occurrence, and so jealous are the Commons of even an appearance of an infringement of their privileges, that they will make a special entry of their reasons for accepting such amendments.”

I think the motion is out of order.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I shall now move the amendment of which I gave notice—to strike out subsection 2 of section 1. I may observe that the amendment which I propose differs essentially in its character from the one which has been disposed of by his honor the Speaker. It is true that this is a clause which at first sight might be considered one of the clauses of a money bill. It is in fact a clause which is entirely independent of the other sections and it is accidental—this is the point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and especially of the Speaker—it is only accidental and refers to a matter which might form in itself a separate bill. If I understand the doctrine it is this: the Senate has no right to amend a money bill; it has a right to reject a money bill. Supposing instead of having put three, four, five and six