

the money over that 15 per cent; and we thought clause 4 followed logically clause 3 by giving the amount in the schedule plus 15 per cent. That is reason. That is the explanation.

Mr. DUMAS: Carried.

Mr. ROSEVEAR: We think it follows logically after clause 3 because for instance if we were in a position where we needed part or the whole of the 15 per cent how would we get it? There is no authority in the bill for getting it.

Mr. GREEN: There is a provision in the other bills, of course, that the railway cannot go over the estimate without the approval of the Governor in Council, which I think is a very wise precaution, but now you are taking the very maximum and adding on the 15 per cent and getting your authority for it. I think it is a very unwise move for the House to take that step. It is far better to leave it at the amount covered by the resolution. In fact, I think this change is completely out of order. The House passed a resolution for \$38,750,000 and now a bill is brought in for \$44,562,500, and if that was the intention then the resolution which was put through the House should have provided for \$44,562,500 and I suggest that the railway certainly was not hurt in the other three bills by having the estimated figures included in the bill and I suggest we stick to that. Of course, it is up to the minister.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: May I just be allowed to say something here? The only difference between this bill and the other three bills is that in this bill what we have done is to spell out the amount of money estimated to be expended plus 15 per cent. In all the other bills this clause which provides for the expenditure of the money was exactly the same as the amount in the estimate. In other words, where the sum \$38,750,000 appears here. If you add up all these amounts the sum \$38,750,000 should appear in that clause we are now discussing and all the Canadian National Railways have done here is to spell it out by adding the 15 per cent. Now, I have spoken again, on that point which was raised, to the clerk counsel and he is definitely of the opinion that this is not out of order because the amount is an estimate. It is estimated at \$38,750,000; however, if it is going to be of any assistance to the committee, in our anxiety and in order to show that we want to go along with any reasonable suggestion, I have no objection whatever to striking out the figure \$44,562,500 and inserting instead \$38,750,000. If it will make the committee happy, then let us do it.

Mr. GREEN: I think in the interests of thrift it would be as well to do that. If you have the larger amount set out there it is always a temptation to spend that amount,—that applies to me and everyone else, I suppose.

Mr. HABEL: It applies to you, too.

Mr. DUMAS: I move this amendment: that we replace the figure of \$44,562,500 with the figure \$38,750,000.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Green made the amendment and perhaps in fairness to Mr. Green we should have him move it and have you second it.

Mr. GREEN: I do not come from Quebec.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: I think it would probably please the honourable member if he were to move the amendment and Mr. Dumas were to second it.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 4 carried as amended.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6 carried.

Clause 7 carried.

Clause 8 carried.

Shall the bill carry?

Carried.