

suspension of the Rule and that the Bill be read the second time presently; but as he has given me no explanation for adopting such a course, and as there is an objection to it, I move that the Bill be read the second time on Wednesday next.

HON. MR. MILLER—I do not know even that that motion should be allowed. This Bill contemplates the building of a bridge across the river Ottawa. I think the policy which is now in favor is to obstruct these navigable streams as little as possible, and perhaps, second to the St. Lawrence alone, is the Ottawa River in this respect. I am not in favor of any one of these projects, and I give my hon. friend notice that I must have ample evidence as to the necessity for this bridge when the Bill is before the committee, before I give it my support.

HON. MR. CLEWOW—There are some very objectionable features in this Bill. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that a Bill has already passed this House providing for one bridge across the Ottawa River here. The promoters have incorporated in this Bill similar rights and privileges, and have also incorporated other rights and privileges of which they have given no notice.

HON. MR. MCKINDSEY—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to discuss the principle of the Bill on this motion for a second reading at a future day.

THE SPEAKER—The point of order is not well taken.

HON. MR. CLEWOW—This Bill asks for the right to build a bridge across the Ottawa, almost at the same point for which another charter has already been granted, and for other rights which the original charter did not give them. They also apply, without notice, for power to build a foot passenger bridge, and to collect tolls. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that when the Morrisburg Railway was before the House, the provision for a bridge across the Ottawa was struck out, on the understanding that there should be only one bridge allowed across the Ottawa River at this point; therefore, it would be very wrong to allow this company to have powers that were struck out of the other company's Bill on the same principle. I think that when the Bill comes before the

committee I shall be able to show that they have incorporated in it several clauses of which notice has not been given, and I shall oppose it on several particulars.

HON. MR. VIDAL—This discussion only shows the inconvenience of debating the principle of the Bill at the wrong stage. I am constrained to say, with the Bill in my hand, that the hon. gentleman from Ottawa has entirely misinterpreted its contents. This Bill merely asks for an extension of time, in order to allow the company to complete their works. There is nothing in the Bill about foot passengers and tolls.

The motion was agreed to.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

HON. MR. SMITH moved that the House do now adjourn.

HON. MR. PERLEY—Before the House adjourns, I wish to state that owing to an irregularity in the notice of motion submitted by me in our routine proceedings to-day, I give notice for Thursday, the 27th instant, that when the House adjourns on that day it do stand adjourned until the 15th of April next, at 8.30 p.m.

HON. MR. MILLER—I would like to know why we were brought here at all to-day, unless it was to hear our prayers. There is no business to be done, and I do not see why the House was not adjourned over Friday until Wednesday next, to allow those gentlemen, who could have done so, to go to their homes. I get up to look at the House, and I am reminded very much of the words of a celebrated orator when he was brought before a Scotch audience. After the cheers had subsided he said: "What have we all come here to-day for? Curiosity? No," said he, "curiosity never brought so many Scotchmen together? It is something else." I say there is neither curiosity nor business, nor anything else that has brought us together. There is no business before the House and no reason why we should not have adjourned over until Wednesday.

HON. MR. DEVER—We could not have adjourned without a notice.

HON. MR. MILLER—The adjournment could have been moved, and that motion could have been carried by the unanimous