

### RESTIGOUCHE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. CAMPBELL (for Mr. Domville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.

Mr. McALISTER. Explain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Full explanations will be given in the Railway Committee, and it is certainly better that objections should be taken and discussed there rather than in the House on the motion for second reading.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will hardly be able to do that. The explanation should be given on the second reading, and the promoter of the Bill should be here to explain it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). This is a Bill connected with the Bill which has just passed its second reading. It is to make connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McALISTER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) state where this connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. gentleman says. I am not acquainted with the details of this Bill but I am safe in saying that the work proposed to be authorized will, if constructed, connect with the Intercolonial Railway on one side of the river and with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway on the other. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood Hamilton) desires that this Bill should pass to the second reading, and I apprehend that there will be no public interest jeopardized if it were referred to the Railway Committee. The whole matter can be fully discussed there.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

### DOMINION SAFE DEPOSIT AND TRUSTS COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Gibson) moved second reading of Bill (No. 106) respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited), and to change the name of the company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).

Mr. WALLACE. I would take objection to the second reading of the Bill, from the fact that the proposal is to change the name of the company to the "Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company." This Parliament has already chartered a company called the Dominion Deposit Company, and I think such a conflict of names should not be allowed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The name could be altered in committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the names conflict it is not likely that the committee would pass the Bill under this name. I quite agree that in the case of a company such as this, the greatest care should be taken not to have conflicting names. If the Bill be allowed to go to committee, we will have evidence as to the companies existing under similar names, and we can change the name of this company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. Champagne.)

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BENNETT. Relative to the grant of \$35,000 for dredging at the port of Owen Sound, before six o'clock I asked the Minister of Public Works who the contractors for this work are, and also the manner in which the work was being performed. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to inform the House that the work was being done by a firm of contractors at \$8 an hour. I then asked the Minister who this firm were, and asked if Mr. John A. Barron and Dr. Horsey were members of it, and the hon. gentleman assured me that the only person he knew in the firm was a Mr. Canan. May I ask the Minister if the work is being done by a joint stock company, or if he is aware of the presence of Mr. Barron and Dr. Horsey in the contracting company; and if there is a written contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The name of the firm in the department is the Canan, Sadler Company.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Minister if Mr. Sadler is known to him as being Mr. Sadler of Lindsay; and furthermore, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has ever been interviewed in reference to the work that has been done this year by Mr. Barron as a member of that firm or on behalf of that firm?

Mr. CAMPBELL. And suppose he has?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) wants to know, "suppose he has." All I wish to know is, if Mr. Barron and Dr. Horsey are of the firm, and if there