

these two amendments, because they are in line with our legislation, and they are in accord with the provisions of the charter of this company. After this explanation I hope my hon. friends will be content to accept the amendment and let the Bill go.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am not disposed to let the Bill go so easily especially as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clemow) in his remarks did not touch one single point of the question before the House. He gave his own *ex parte* statement of a great variety of things which were presented before the committee. The committee heard all these statements.

HON. MR. CLEMOW—The House did not.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I said the committee heard all these statements—heard every thing that could be advanced in proof of them—heard and read all these documents, and the decision of that committee, by a very large majority, was that the Bill should be reported to the House without any amendment. The hon. gentleman has told us his motive for repeating his statements. He wishes to have them recorded in the official report. That is the object. It is not to convince the House. If he had acted consistently with his speech his motion would not be to make this amendment, but that the Bill should be read the third time this day six months. I do not think his statements, which were answered in the committee, should go upon the *Debates* without some remarks being made to show that they are not quite so straightforward and so correct as the House would be led to suppose. The hon. gentleman wished to create the impression that this charter had been in existence for eight years and nothing had been done under it. I wish to inform the House that some seventy miles of road has been built by that company.

HON. MR. CLEMOW—I was speaking of the bridge.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It is not a bridge company; it is the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company that need the bridge as part of their line. They have built some seventy miles of road, and it has been in operation for years; and they have also constructed, ready for the laying of the rails, some twenty miles of another road

up the Gatineau. The company has shown its *bona fides* in this way—that its road is a road which is in existence and in operation, and is entitled to get an extension of time, which has never been refused to any *bona fide* company by Parliament. The hon. gentleman says they did not have any right to make a bridge at first. That is so, but two years after they got their charter they found that a road without power to extend their line into Ontario was useless. The road could never be a success without access to the Ontario side of the river, and the building of the bridge is part of the scheme necessary to their existence. If the hon. gentleman will look into their charter as it exists, he will find that it speaks of the construction of approaches to the bridge. What does an approach on the Ottawa side mean but a short line in Ontario, and no objection for want of specific notice was made in the House of Commons. This objection was not sustained when it was before our committee, because it was considered that the very fact of having the right to make the bridge was sufficient notice that the railway had to be made on this side to get to it. And then, again, why is a notice required to be given for the construction of a line of railway? Is it not in order that the proprietors of the land through which the line is to pass, and of the adjacent lands, shall have notice of it to enable them to guard their rights? Now, it so happens that the whole of this land through which the line is to pass is owned by the Government; and the Government have had notice of it, because they have had plans of the bridge since December last in their possession and raised no objection. I think, therefore, that the objection as to want of notice has no force. A great deal has been said about the understanding between the respective companies. My hon. friend has been misinformed or misled on that point. There was no such thing as an understanding come to on the part of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company. There was no one authorized to make such an arrangement for it at any meeting of the directors. They regarded their interests as protected by the fact of a number of their directors being put on the Board of the Interprovincial Bridge Company. For what purpose? In order that there should be, as I hope there will be, an