

TOLEDO GLASS COMPANY, PATENTS OF THE—IN COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Postmaster General)—*Con.*

is simply a matter of Justice and fair play—3720. I believe if this Bill is not passed an injustice will be done Mr. Herdt. The committee was willing to accept the usual clause as a rider to the Bill, but it was said it was not needed because the patent had not expired at the time—3721. It was shown before the committee what are to be manufactured with this machine are to-day imported exclusively from Germany and Belgium, and, therefore, would not interfere with the output of the Sydenham Glass Company; \$17,000 has actually been spent, and it would be a glaring injustice not to extend a measure of relief—3732. It is the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) who presents the Bill—3736.

Maclean, W. F. (South York)—3738.

The Prime Minister is shifting the responsibility onto the House. The doctrine is that the government is responsible for all legislation whether it be public or private Bills, and the Prime Minister cannot shirk the responsibility—3738.

Macpherson, R. G. (Vancouver)—3732.

The druggists and manufacturing chemists of this country—some 4,500—are to-day paying too much for their bottles, and would pay a great deal more if the Sydenham and Wallaceburg people were not in business—3732. This House should not stand behind any Bill which is designed to promote a monopoly—3733.

Sproule, T. S. (East Grey)—3722.

If this Bill should pass then we exempt the patent from the clause of the Act of 1903, which provides that within a certain time the patented article must be manufactured in Canada—3722.

TOLEDO GLASS COMPANY, PATENTS OF THE—IN COMMITTEE.

House again in committee on Bill (110) respecting certain patents of the Toledo Glass Company—Mr. Stewart—3952. Motion that order be discharged and Bill referred back to committee on miscellaneous Private Bills—Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Motion agreed to—3952.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister)—3952.

Moves that order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills—3952.

TORONTO, NIAGARA AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—THIRD READING.

House went into committee on Bill (134) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Company, and to change its name to the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company—Mr. Guthrie—4389. Motion to amend

TORONTO, NIAGARA AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—THIRD READING—*Con.*

—Mr. Guthrie—4389. Amendment withdrawn—4396. Bill reported and read the third time. Motion that the Bill be now passed—Mr. Guthrie. Motion agreed to—4397.

Barker, S. (Hamilton)—4393.

The power company has paid for only the right of way for a power line, and I think it a most impudent Bill to bring into the House to seek power from parliament to allow the power company to transfer its rights to a railway company—4393.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways)—4390.

We want to protect the rights of those who alienated their lands for the purpose of a power company only and not for a railway—4390. I certainly could not give my assent as a member of the committee to the proposed amendment—4395. I think that covers everything—4397.

Guthrie, Hugh (South Wellington)—4389.

On sections 6 and 6a—I gave notice of a motion to amend both section 6 and section 6a—4389. The power company have now an eighty year purchase for power purposes, and the railway proposes to utilize that right of way—4390. The sense of the committee was entirely in favour of the proposal that one right of way should serve all purposes—4391. I cannot see any reason for delay such as would be involved in sending the company before the Railway Commission. I think we have properly safeguarded the interests of all parties—4392. The power company, in purchasing this right of way in all cases, with the exception of a matter of some two or three miles, took deeds for the use of the land both for power and for railway purposes—4393. The deeds were all before the Railway Committee—4394. I ask leave to withdraw the amendment, and to let the Bill stand as it came from the Railway Committee 4396.

Henderson, David (Halton)—4395.

I would say that the contract as contained in the deed after the grant has been made would prevail rather than a recital in the earlier part of the deed—4395. If the farmers are entitled to additional compensation for the additional injury which is done to their property, I say we ought to give it to them—4396.

Lancaster, E. A. (Lincoln and Niagara)—4390.

I think the Bill, as sent from the committee, is right, and that the promoters got all they reasonably ought to expect in this case—4390. It would be a dangerous precedent to put into a special Act of this kind a privilege which is not allowed to other railway companies—4391. I think the Bill, as it is, makes it safe for the land owner, because the Railway Commission is required to sanction it—4394. On section 6a—I think it might have been more clearly worded—4396. I think the Railway Commission will probably have