

## After Recess.

ALBERT RAILWAY COMPANY  
BILL.

(Mr. Domville.)

SENATE AMENDMENT POSTPONED.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved :

"That the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill No. 48, to grant additional powers to the Albert Railway Company, be now taken into consideration and concurred in."

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) said there were some grave considerations why the amendments should not be concurred in. Their adoption would place certain persons in the county of Albert in a very awkward position. The Bill also enabled the company, which had not one dollar of stock paid up, to issue an unlimited amount of promissory notes which would add to the liabilities of the corporation, while the Local Government had limited the borrowing powers to \$600,000. He moved :

"That the consideration of the amendments to the Bill be postponed till this day three months."

Mr. TUPPER said he thought the House would hardly be disposed to concur in the amendment just moved. The Bill had been carefully considered by the Railway Committee, and the Minister of Marine, a representative of the adjacent county, took great interest in its promotion ; and that Committee reported it to the House with such amendments as they thought necessary. The Bill passed through its different stages, and was sent to the Senate. It was open, of course, now, to consider the amendments made by the Senate, but he thought their criticisms should be limited to those amendments, which diminished instead of increased the powers granted by the Bill. The Senate had merely added the words "or others." He hoped the House would feel that the general merits of the Bill ought not now to be taken up.

Mr. HOLTON said that the question before the House was, of course, that of the Senate amendments. This Bill had, however, been brought in at the early part of the Session in a form in which the Railway Committee absolutely refused to consider it. It was

taken up again and to a considerable extent remodelled so that it was hardly in any sense the Bill which was first introduced. He understood the Bill was objectionable on its merits. Gentlemen from New Brunswick assured him that it was a vicious Bill, *ab initio*. He did not know anything about the company or about the country which it was proposed the railway should traverse ; but when gentlemen from the neighbourhood, in whom he had confidence, gave him such an assurance, he had no option but to act upon it.

Mr. DOMVILLE said the best legal advice had been obtained as to the absolute necessity of the proposed legislation. The hon. the Minister of Marine had been firmly of the opinion that the Bill was a good one ; it had been delayed on account of some technicality, and New Brunswick members, through the hon. member for Albert, had agreed to the new Bill which that hon. gentleman had informed him had his hearty approval. Only three or four members were opposed to it, among whom were the hon. members for Kent and Sunbury.

Mr. CAMERON said he was astonished at the argument of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) who said that, because certain members of the House had represented to him privately that the Bill was vicious in principle, he had such confidence in their private representations that he was prepared to oppose it. The House, however, had already affirmed the Bill and passed it. The Senate had added words which did not alter the principle in any way, and yet, on concurrence in those amendments, it was proposed to defeat the whole Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL said the House would be stultifying itself if it refused to pass the Bill.

Mr. McLEOD said his object in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) was this : that there were few members from New Brunswick in this House who regarded this Bill in any light but as pernicious in its effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD rose to a point of order. The debate must be confined to the amendments from