

He said: It appears there was a mistake in the drawing up of the clause with reference to the conditions attached to the work. The St. Catharines road has been partly built through towns and cities and they have been granted by this Bill an extension of time for the completion of the work, and conditions have been attached to it with respect to the parts which have yet to be built. The proviso is, if they are not built within a certain time these powers fall, but the wording of the Bill makes it apply to the whole of the work which has already been built as well; therefore it is better that it should go back to the committee for further consideration.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is it proposed in any way to extend the powers of that company or restrict them, or give them further rights in any municipality without the consent of the municipality?

Hon. Mr. KERR—This Bill is one for an extension of time for the completion of the works, and there are conditions attached to that in favour of the cities and towns, meaning the city of Hamilton and the city of Toronto. These conditions, it was intended, should only be applied to the extension of work to which time is now given, but this railway is already built. Part of its work is through the city of St. Catharines, part of it is in the towns and villages along the road between Hamilton and St. Catharines, part of it is in Clifton or Niagara Falls, and the effect of this would be that the whole undertaking might be forfeited instead of the part to which extension is being given.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the report of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce on Bill (Z) An Act relating to the Water Carriage of Goods.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I should like to call the attention of the House to the same irregularity that presents itself in this case as the one I pointed out yesterday, only I

Hon. Mr. KERR.

think it is a little worse. This Bill was referred to the committee from this House. The committee appointed a sub-committee which brought in a new Bill altogether. The Bill has been redrafted, and nothing of that fact appears in our minutes. When we look in our minutes to see what it means, we find nothing. Those amendments should have been printed in our minutes; we have a right to see them. Those of us who are not on the Committee on Banking and Commerce have a right to see what those amendments are.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The Bill has been reprinted.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The amendments were reprinted.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Where is the French edition of it?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The Bill was amended. It was not referred to a sub-committee, but was considered by the committee and redrafted and reprinted.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That is not the point at all that my hon. friend takes. I wish it distinctly understood that I do not rise for the purpose of obstructing the passing of the Bill. On the contrary. The mode in which the report from the committee has been presented to the House is totally irregular. If you read rule 127 you will find what the duties of a chairman are:

The chairman of a committee shall sign with his name at length, a printed copy of the Bill, on which the amendments are fairly written.

Now, in this case the Bill as amended, has never been presented to the House, but has been reprinted. It is a totally different Bill from that which was referred to the committee. Then the rule continues:

And shall also sign with the initials of his name, the several amendments made and clauses added in committee to be attached to the report, and another copy of the Bill, with the amendment written thereon, shall be prepared by the clerk of the committee and filed.

Now, the Clerk has no such copy. What should have been done was to report from the committee the Bill as amended, with the amendments attached to the original Bill, and then the House, before adopting