

less the government announced a policy in consonance with it.

Mr. EMMERSON. When this Bill was under the consideration of the Railway Committee the hon. member (Mr. Foster) proposed the following amendment:

3a. It is hereby provided that the Governor in Council shall grant no permission to construct any part of the proposed road south of the International boundary unless it be shown to be necessary in order to overcome engineering difficulties, nor until satisfactory guarantees are given that the line from Cloverdale to Princeton will be completed on Canadian territory within a reasonable time.

After some discussion it was agreed that the consideration of that proposed amendment would be gone on with in the House. It involved a question of policy that might or might not affect the government, and the Minister of Finance suggested that in the meantime the government might consider the matter and make an announcement to the House. The matter has been considered and in the judgment of the government they do not deem it necessary to impose these restrictions on this railway.

On section 3,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This clause is amended by striking out the word 'company' in the 43rd line and replacing it by the words 'Governor in Council'; and in the 46th line by adding after the word 'may' the words, 'subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners.'

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do I understand the statement made by the Minister of Railways to cover the objection taken by the Minister of Justice that the Bill as framed would probably divert trade from Canada? Is it the intention of the government to insert any protecting clause in the Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. How do we come to consider the first clause? I did not understand that the other clauses of the Bill were carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. All the clauses of the Bill have been carried except 3 and 4.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not understand it that way.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member (Mr. Haggart) is correct as to what took place in the Railway Committee, but the Bill has since been before the Committee of the Whole House and all the clauses except 3 and 4 were carried.

Mr. HAGGART. I was not in the House when that was done.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that this is the only amendment to be made to clause 3?

Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would suggest that one thing should be done at a time.

Mr. BERGERON. In the Railway Committee as well as in the House the other night, there was a question as to the wording of this clause and the House waited an expression of opinion from the government. There is more in the clause than the reference to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. For instance the last five lines of the clause read:

And may construct, aid in the construction of, and when constructed maintain and operate such part of the continuous line of the companies railway instead of the line authorized by the Acts relating to the company and by this Act.

I understood from the Minister of Justice that this wording would be changed. It would seem to create two companies instead of one which would be a most extraordinary proceeding.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has been considered by the Railway Committee, such as it is, and approved.

Mr. BERGERON. It was only passed by the Railway Committee on the understanding that an announcement would be made by the government in the House and that some change might be made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only expression of opinion asked from the government was on the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the Minister of Railways has said that we have no intention of accepting this amendment.

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of the last five lines of the clause, to which I would refer the right hon. gentleman. It looks as if the intention were to incorporate two companies instead of one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The attention of the government has never been called to that point.

Mr. HENDERSON. An hon. member a few moments ago asked why the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not here. I have already explained that the hon. member was under the impression that this matter would not come up until Wednesday. However, I think it makes no difference now. The government having announced their policy on the question, I do not think any one on this side of the House desires to move that amendment. I had a good deal to say with respect to this Bill in the Railway Committee. I never opposed the construction of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway; only I contend that it should be constructed throughout on Canadian territory in accordance with the original charter. I still hold to the same opinion, and I believe that those who voted in the Railway Committee as I did felt that the original desire of the people of British