

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Bill 47 is to amend the general Railway Act, and Bill 6 is to amend the Government Railway Act—two different Bills for two different Acts.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The object is the same in both Bills, respecting the crossing of railway tracks without stopping.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think it would be well, as I see notices of other Bills respecting railways, that the two Bills before us to-day should not be passed until the others that may be brought before us amending the Railway Acts are under consideration, and they may then be all placed under one Bill. In regard to the question of allowing a Bill of this kind, of course I am unable to speak with any certain knowledge of the interlocking switch and signal system proposed. In the past we know that where railways intersect each other the trains are bound to stop one minute before crossing. This is necessary for the purpose of safety. The interlocking switch referred to in clause 1 of the Bill may or may not be a success. Unless it is absolutely safe, of course it would be unwise to put it in operation; but the Railway Committee of the Privy Council seem to take the responsibility for that. In regard to the third clause of the Bill, that relating to hurdle gates, I confess I am unable to understand it. The clause reads as follows:—

“In the case of the ‘hurdle gate’ mentioned in section thirteen of the said Act, two upright posts supporting the gate at each end, if the gate is fifteen inches longer than the opening, shall be deemed to be proper fastenings within the meaning of the said Act.”

HON. MR. ALLEN—Are you reading Bill 47 now?

HON. MR. SCOTT—Yes, I am reading Bill 47, and I confess I am quite unable to understand the idea that the person drafting this Bill had in his mind. I have some familiarity with hurdle gates, and how they are made, but I confess, after reading this clause, that I am quite unable to give any advice as to the mode of construction, whether

the gate is to be fifteen inches higher than the fence, or whether it is to be fifteen inches higher than the opening is wide, or how it is to be hung—which is exceedingly confusing. I would ask the Minister to have the attention of whoever drew this Bill called to this particular paragraph, and have it made clearer than it is at present.

HON. MR. POWER—I would also respectfully suggest to the Minister that inasmuch as those two Bills are intended to make identical provisions for railways that belong to the Government and railways that belong to companies, as a matter of convenience they should be consolidated into one Bill, as they are really the same legislation applied to two kinds of railways.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I am surprised at my hon. friend making that statement. Bill 47 applies to the General Railway Act, while Bill 6 relates to the Government Railways Act. Supposing my hon. friend wants to find an amendment to the Government Railways Act he will turn to the Government Railways Act for it; and in the same way if he wants to find an amendment of the the General Railways Act he will refer to that Act for it.

HON. MR. DEVER—Would it not be better for the leader of the Government, as he has not the legal knowledge necessary to explain this Bill, to withdraw it for a day or two until it is thoroughly understood and explained by the law officers of the Government. I see no necessity for hurrying this legislation, and I think if the leader of the Government would only allow it to lie over for a day or two it would be better. That is what Sir Alexander Campbell would do if he were leader.

HON. MR. SMITH—If the House will allow the Bill to be read a second time and refer it to a Committee of the Whole, it can be explained and discussed there.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.