

In that way the amendment could be moved, but if we are going to touch the Bill at all it will be open for discussion.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—No. We would simply discuss the amendments.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE—The amendments if you like; but it will bring the Bill before us again. What is the objection to the hon. leader of the House moving that such a Bill be reconsidered? The question will be open and we will consider it. I think that is the proper course to pursue.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—There is a motion for concurrence in the message, and I think there is a point of order raised by the senator from Halifax that this motion is irregular, and that the message should not be received. Does the hon. gentleman raise the question on a point of order or by an amendment?

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise to a question of order. I hold that it is irregular and unparliamentary, after the Bill has passed through all its stages in both Houses, for either House to undertake to amend it.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The question is on the point of order.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Might I ask: Supposing the House grants the consent asked for in the message, will the Bill have to be sent back to the Commons with the additional amendments—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—We would have to consider the amendments ourselves.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I have some further motions on that point.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—What position would it be in if we give the consent asked for? The Bill will have to be returned to us from the Commons to ask our concurrence in the additional amendments which have been added to the Bill. Then the Bill, not having been sent to the Commons, still being here, the order of the Senate not having been carried out, what would be the procedure?

The SPEAKER—I was about to put the motion. If no question of order is raised—

Hon. Mr. POWER—I thought I had raised the question of order.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE.

The SPEAKER—I am of the opinion that the motion is in order. It seems to me it is exactly the parallel of the case where we made a mistake in a Bill and sent our clerk down to the House of Commons to correct it.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Will the Speaker be good enough to cite the rule of the House, because we have a rule which says that the Speaker, in giving a decision, shall cite the authority.

The SPEAKER—I cited Bourinot, and a precedent, and have given a decision which is my own.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved that the proceedings of the Senate, had on the amendments to the said Bill on the 14th instant, be now read.

The motion was agreed to on a division, and the 'Minutes' were read at the table.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved that the said proceedings just read at the table be rescinded.

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved that the amendments as corrected, made to the said Bill, be agreed to. He said: The amendments are for the purpose of protecting the rights of the municipalities as well as the rights of the city of Montreal. One of the amendments omitted is in the 5th clause, and is as follows:—

But no such rate or charge shall be demanded or taken until it has been approved of by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, who may also revise such rates and charges from time to time.

This was omitted in the transmission of the Bill to this House. Then again, in clause 8, the Senate allowed them to connect with any railways coming to the city of Montreal, or which might hereafter enter the city of Montreal. The House of Commons, according to their rules, require that these railways should be named, and so they have given them power to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and others mentioned. Those amendments are all to restrict the powers of the company, and pro-