

possess, in this particular instance. Parliament itself has had a policy upon this subject. It has declared that this office shall be held with a salary not exceeding a certain amount, and it declares that the person holding that office shall be the subordinate of a particular Department of the Government, indicating clearly what the policy of Parliament is upon that subject. And taking that view it is clear that the Government cannot adopt a policy which will, in effect, repeal a particular provision of the law and make that a mere volunteer's office which by the provision of the law itself is really a Parliamentary office.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY LEASE BILL.

On the Order for Private Bills being called,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before we proceed to the consideration of private Bills, I desire to submit, as a question of privilege the matter which I brought up a day or two ago. The point I submitted was that a Bill before this House cannot be promoted by any member who has advised on the Bill in his professional capacity. I charged that in the particular instance in question, that of Bill (No 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and for other purposes, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) was the paid counsel or solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I charged that as such he had prepared and gone through the Bill in question, and I argued that accordingly he was incapable of promoting the Bill in Parliament. You Mr. Speaker, ruled against the point I took. I think there may probably have been a misapprehension as to the question submitted. I refer you again, Mr. Speaker, to the rule under which I submitted that question. It is a rule passed in 1856 by the Imperial House of Commons, and is referred to at pages 99 and 390 of *May*. The Bill now stands in the name of another hon. member, and of course the question is not of so much importance, except as settling the rules and practice of the House. I do not propose to discuss the question now, although I intended to discuss it at that time. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the question the other night was as to the hon. member having a pecuniary interest in the Bill, and I read the decision of *May* on that point. But there is a rule of the House of Commons in England, which I presume is applicable to this House. It is as follows:—

"That it is contrary to the usage, and derogatory to the dignity of this House, that any of its members should bring forward, promote or advocate in this House any proceeding or measure in which he may have acted or been concerned, for or in consideration of any pecuniary fee or reward."

That is a resolution of the House of Commons of England, which I presume applies to this House.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Before the preamble is adopted, I should like some explanation as to the pecuniary results. Of course the hon. gentleman will understand that the pecuniary results, in so far as they affect the Canadian Pacific Railway, are of public interest, in view of their relations to the country, and also with respect to the question of tolls. This

question becomes of still greater importance in consequence of a declaration not long since made on behalf of the Government, that they would decline to accept securities on lines leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dreading the responsibilities in which they might possibly be involved by reason of those leases. The Bill before us is one which proposes to legalize a lease, and the preamble recites that it is expedient to do so, and the lease is made a schedule of the Bill. Under the lease, as proposed to be legalized, very large but indefinite sums, which I cannot compute, are agreed to be paid. What I should like to know is, what is the gross sum of the rental or annual consideration that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be called on to pay in virtue of this agreement?

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company guarantee to the Company 5 per cent. on the cost of the road. The cost of the road will be \$25,000 a mile, for the number of miles built, together with \$2,000,000 of the original stock of the Company.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the mileage?

Mr. HAGGART. It is from Montreal to St. Thomas, and the extension from St. Thomas to Windsor. The distance, I understand, is a little over 400 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the \$25,000 per mile include the cost of the bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. No; there is the additional cost of the bridge across the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Then we have not got the full obligation yet.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimated cost of the bridge and approaches into the city of Montreal, is limited to \$3,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Is interest paid on that at 5 per cent.?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; after the money is expended.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it will be \$25,000 a mile on about 400 miles, and in addition \$3,000,000 on the bridge, and in addition \$2,000,000 of stock.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that \$25,000 a mile would be the cost of the road.

Mr. HAGGART. No; it has been paid at par, in cash, which is part of the cost of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. Part of the cost? Then the road is estimated to cost more than \$25,000 a mile?

Mr. HAGGART. Part of it.

Mr. BLAKE. But all over?

Mr. HAGGART. The average price will be over \$25,000 a mile, as some of it is \$25,000 and some of it more than that.

Mr. BLAKE. We know, from the railway statistics, and I mentioned it formerly in the House, that the cost of the Credit Valley part, over what was paid by the Government and the municipalities, would not have been much more than \$10,000 a mile. So the remainder is going to cost a great deal of money, at that rate.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the cost of the Credit Valley is a great deal more than that.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course I feel for my hon. friend's difficulties in promoting this Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. The first clause has been considerably altered in Committee, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to explain the alterations.