

the Government lines to the Nova Scotia Company, and if we desired at any time to make it a part of the postal system, as in England, it would facilitate such a policy and make a basis for the compensation to be given to the companies.

The amendment was then put, and lost on the following votes:—

CONTENTS—The Honorable Messieurs Botsford, Dickey, Howlan, Kaulbach, Read, Skead, Trudel—7.

NON-CONTENTS—The Honorable Messieurs Allan, Baillargeon, Benson, Bourinot, Bureau, Chaffers, Chapais, Chinic, Cormier, Dever, Fabre, Flint, Girard, Christie (Speaker), Haythorne, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McClelan, McLelan, McMaster, Macdonald, Macpherson, Miller, Montgomery, Odell, Paquet, Penny, Scott, Seymour, Wilnot—30.

HON. MR. TRUDEL said he previously took occasion to express his opinion that a certain portion of clause 15 involved a wrong principle of legislation, and he proposed to strike out that part of the clause from the 21st to the 41st lines. He therefore moved, seconded by the HON. MR. BELLE-ROSE,

“To leave out all the words after ‘be,’ and insert ‘committed to a Committee of the Whole House,’ with instructions to amend it as follows: Leave out all the words in the 15th clause from the words ‘Act of Parliament,’ in the twenty-fourth line of the said clause, to the words, ‘Provided that any grant,’ in the forty-fifth line of the said clause.”

The question of concurrence being put thereon, the same was, on a division, resolved in the negative.

HON. MR. ALLAN said he did not propose to try the patience of the House by making a speech, since hon. gentlemen were already wearied enough of this debate, and he was as anxious as any one to see it brought to a close. He wished to say, however, that he voted against the bill introduced last session because he did not consider that the parties whose interests were affected by it had had a fair opportunity of representing their case, or being heard in defence of their rights. He was the more moved to take that course because—whether purposely or not—the bill of last session was so framed as, if not actually to mislead, at all events to keep out of

sight as much as possible the real point at issue. He should vote against the present bill, because he considered it tainted with an unjust disregard of vested rights, altogether contrary to the spirit of British legislation. He was the more induced to take this course now because he did not look upon the bill as a *bonâ fide* public measure, but a bill introduced at the instance and in the interest of one company, and directed against the interests and vested rights of another company.

HON. MR. CARRALL wished to give the reasons for his vote. Last year he voted against the second reading of the bill because many eminent gentlemen claimed that the company possessed vested rights. He had now arrived at the conclusion that no case of vested rights had been made out. Furthermore, if the company had any equitable rights, these were provided for by a clause since substituted in the bill. Therefore he could not see that the gentlemen who urged the throwing out of this bill had any grievous cause of complaint against the House. Hence he felt no reluctance in casting his vote in favor of the bill. He highly eulogized Mr. Field for his eminent qualities, and did not think this bill was going to do him injustice.

HON. MR. VIDAL desired to have placed on record in a permanent form the protest of those opposed to the bill. He therefore moved, seconded by the HON. MR. DICKEY, in the first line of section 15, to strike out the words “is now or.” He explained that the effect of expunging these words would be to protect the House from the charge of *ex post facto* legislation.

HON. MR. SKEAD said he was almost bewildered as to the course he ought to take, but when he saw eminent legal gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces opposing the bill for a whole week in the interests of this company, he made up his mind that some injustice was being perpetrated against the company. He believed this country had reaped immense advantages from the work of this company, and now were we going to take away all their rights and privileges and give them to another company? We owed a duty to the people on the other side, to the