

good faith it is natural to suppose that with all the companies interested it would have been possible to get assistance from the three Governments and the city to enable them to build the bridge immediately. If the Pontiac Pacific Junction Company can build a bridge themselves and can give us the facilities offered by the Interprovincial Bridge Company I will be satisfied. We want a bridge that will be sufficient for public business, and which will be open to all railway companies. I have laid the facts before the House, and I do not believe that they can be controverted. It does seem to me, however, to be a violation of an agreement that should not be allowed. The amendments I propose will do not harm if inserted in the Bill, and they may do a great deal of good. They are copied from the Interprovincial Bridge Company's charter, and if it was right to insert them there it certainly cannot be wrong to insert them in the Bill now before us. I therefore move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be amended by adding the following as clauses A and B:—

“ Clause A.”

“So soon as the said bridge over the Ottawa river, at or near the city of Ottawa, is completed and ready for traffic, all trains of all railways connecting with the same, now constructed or hereafter to be constructed, and also the trains and cars of all companies whose lines connect with the line of any company so connecting with the said bridge and approaches, shall have and be entitled to the same and equal rights and privileges in the passage of the said bridge, and in the use of the lines of railway of the company connecting therewith, so that no discrimination or preference in the passage of the said bridge and in the use of the lines of railway of the company connecting therewith, or in tariff rates for transportation, shall be made in favor of or against any railway whose trains or business pass over the said bridge.”

“ Clause B.”

“In case of any disagreement as to the rights of any railway whose trains or business pass over the bridge, and the lines of railway of the company connecting therewith, or as to the tariff rates to be charged in respect thereof, the same shall be determined by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as provided in section eleven of ‘The Railway Act.’”

HON. MR. DICKEY—I do not think there can be any difficulty about this matter when I come to explain exactly how it stands. I do not enter into a discussion of the merits of the Bill at all, but with regard to this particular clause in amendment. My hon. friend who has charge of the Bill has very properly and fairly said that he does not object to these amendments; on the contrary, he thinks

them perfectly right, but he says they exist already in the charter of this company. Now that is the point. This gives power to all railways connecting to have the same rights and privileges in the use of the said bridge. That power is given by the Act which has been read, and no other power as regards that part of the matter, and the reason of it is perfectly obvious: there is no power to enable other lines of railway to run their cars over the railway which this company is authorized to construct, connecting with the bridge, for the obvious reason that at that time the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway had no power to build a railway on this side of the river at all to connect with other railways. They had only power to construct a bridge, but no power to construct a short railway, as they now have, around Nepean Point to connect with lines on this side. Therefore, they had not this additional power which I now read, “the same and equal rights and privileges in the passage of the said bridge and in the use of the lines of railway of the company connecting therewith.” That is the material point, so that “no discrimination or preference in the passage of the said bridge and in the use of the lines of railway of the company connecting therewith, or in tariff rates for transportation, shall be made in favor of or against any railway whose trains or business pass over the said bridge.” Gentlemen will see that if it is necessary to have any legislation with regard to the railway in connection with it, these amendments will be absolutely necessary, for the simple reason that they are not in the original charter clause at all: and as they are not in the clause it is right that they should be in the amendment, and it is necessary, for this reason, that the regulation of the powers for going over the bridge is perfectly futile and useless, unless you extend those powers to the railway which connects that bridge with the existing lines of railway. The House will see therefore that this is absolutely necessary. It would be in vain that you should leave them with a power which they, undoubtedly, possess under the charter, of having the same rights over the bridge when they have not the right of way over the railway to get to the bridge itself and to the lines on the other side of the river. That being plain, I think the House will have no difficulty in accepting