

Mr. OLIVER: What are the features of this Bill?

Mr. LANCASTER: It is a Bill amending the original charter and providing for a renewal. We have passed the Bill as it came from the Senate without any amendment. The length of the line of railway was erroneously stated in the charter of 1911 at 480 miles, the length actually being 610 miles. That amendment was made by the Senate and the Railway Committee did not object to it. The securities issued by the company are increased from \$35,000 and \$50,000 per mile to \$50,000 per mile. The charter of 1911 allowed the company to bond the railway to the extent of \$35,000 per mile in Alberta, and to the extent of \$50,000 per mile in British Columbia. This amendment Bill allows them to bond to an extent not exceeding \$50,000 per mile all through. In the Railway Committee we inquired of gentlemen from Alberta about the matter and they thought that that amount was reasonable, because the northern part of the province is mountainous more or less. As the Senate passed it in that way we saw no objection to increasing the amount to \$50,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What are the terminal points?

Mr. LANCASTER: It runs from Bella Coola or Dean channel, the starting point being alternative in the charter of 1911. Then it runs to Dunvegan, passing through Fort James and Fort McLeod.

Mr. OLIVER: Would Dunvegan be the terminal, and would the railway pass Fort James and Fort McLeod?

Mr. LANCASTER: I will read the section authorizing the construction of the railway:

The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches running from a point at or near Bella Coola on Burk channel in the province of British Columbia, thence by way of the Bella Coola river and the most feasible route therefrom to a point at or near Fort Fraser, or from a point at or near Dean channel in the said province of British Columbia, thence by the most feasible route to Fort Fraser aforesaid, thence northerly passing east of Stuart lake to a point at or near Fort St. James, and thence northeasterly to a point at or near Fort McLeod, and thence through the Pine pass to Peace river to a point at or near Dunvegan, in the province of Alberta.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### HUDSON BAY, PEACE RIVER AND PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 157, respecting the Hudson Bay, Peace River

Mr. COCHRANE.

and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to have a similar explanation with regard to the route of this railway.

Mr. LANCASTER: The route is from Winnipeg to Fort Nelson and Fort Churchill, and then it branches westerly from Fort Churchill to Fort Vermilion, and thence to Fort Simpson.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any mention of the pass by which it crosses the mountains?

Mr. LANCASTER: The clause authorizing the construction of the railways, section 8, chapter 93 of the statutes of 1911 reads:

The company may lay out, construct and operate a line of railway, of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches from the city of Winnipeg, easterly and northerly, to Fort Nelson on Hudson bay; thence in a northwesterly direction to Fort Churchill on Hudson bay; thence westerly between the 58th and 60th parallels of latitude to a point at or near Fort Vermilion on the Peace river; thence in a southwesterly direction to a point at or near Fort St. John; thence westerly, but slightly south, though keeping north of the 56th parallel, to a point where the Nass river crosses the 56th parallel; thence down either the east or west side of the Nass to a point near where it enters the Pacific ocean; and thence to Fort Simpson; and from a point on the aforesaid coast at or near Fort St. John, southeasterly to the city of Edmonton in the province of Alberta; and from a point on the said line of railway at or near the Cochrane river southerly and southwesterly to the city of Prince Albert, in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. OLIVER: I had in my mind that in one of these Bills provision was made for a junction with the line of another company, the Edmonton Dunvegan and Peace River Company. Is it in either of these two Bills?

Mr. LANCASTER: Not in either of these two Bills?

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### NIPISSING CENTRAL RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 135, respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

On section 1—extension of time for completion:

Mr. LANCASTER: We have added three sections here—3, 4 and 5. I fancy that the Senate overlooked them because they have the same model clauses that we have for the protection of provincial rights as to water powers and the control of highways by municipalities. I need not, I hope, on a