

that it was proved, that the simple fact of such a raft being moored in front of a country residence depreciated the value of the property. Raftsmen may be very good in their own rank, but they are not a very particular class of people; and it was proved in the case of my hon. friend, who obtained damages from the owner of the raft, that they were not desirable neighbors, and that they rendered his property almost uninhabitable. Every property on the Ottawa River would be placed in the same position if this Bill passed, and the owners would have no remedy in law. I hope my hon. friend, when he reflects on the consequences of the passage of such a Bill as this, will give up the idea of bringing it up again next Session.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am sorry that my two hon. friends do not seem to understand me in the explanation which I gave to the House. I object to this Bill myself, because the purpose of it is to get possession of the whole river.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I say that in the most explicit terms. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Langelier) that there is great objection in having a raft moored in front of any property. It is against the law at the present time; and I would never consent to have it changed without providing full compensation. I would point out that there is a clause in this Bill whereby, if anyone should suffer damages because of the construction of a boom, or anything connected with it, in front of his property, he can receive full compensation. It is a very different thing in the case of the raft referred to by my hon. friend, because the owner of that raft wished to moor it there the whole summer without paying anything

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Where is the clause for compensation in the Bill?

Mr. GIROUARD. There is a clause providing for compensation, and the promoters of this Bill intended to pay compensation for any property they might injure or take possession of. There is a provision, just at the end of section three, which says: "that they will pay compensation to any individual injured thereby." The promoters of this Bill intend to pay compensation in front of any property where they will have their boom. They intend inserting in the next Bill a clause to arrange compensation by private agreement with the proprietors, so that nobody will have cause to complain. I am surprised that my hon. friend did not understand my opening remarks. I said that the reason why I objected to this Bill was because it gave the company control of the river between Ottawa and Montreal, and I object to that. They want to have the right to boom at the foot of the Carillon Rapids, but in such a way as not to interfere with navigation. I believe that this boom can be erected without any interference with navigation, but if that cannot be done, the Bill will not have my support.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I intend to introduce the Bill in a different form next Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, we will see what the Bill looks like then.

Mr. GIROUARD. Very well.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I told my hon. friend who has this Bill in charge, that it was out of the question to have it passed in this House, because it interfered, not only with private property, but with public works of great magnitude which had cost a great sum of money to the country, and that we could not allow the company to interfere with the navigation of that river. My hon. friend

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

speaks of the compensation that the company would have to pay to private individuals, but I suppose that we should not give such powers to a private company except for very strong reasons, and because the granting of such powers would be in the public interest. The powers now asked for are purely and simply in the interests of a private company, and we should certainly respect the rights of riparian proprietors as much as we should respect the rights of a private company. If this Bill were for the public good, generally, it would be all right. Of course private rights must give way before the public good, with proper compensation; but if it is only to substitute one private interest for another I don't think it is a measure that we should support. I stated to my hon. friend, also, that I had very great doubts that the Bill could be gone on with in the modified shape in which it was intended to bring it before the committee; and I tell him now, so that the parties who wish to have this power may know, that unless they give good proof that the rights they are asking will not interfere with navigation or with the public works on the river, or with private rights to any considerable extent, he cannot expect the Bill, at all events, to have my support.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, because I think this is one of the most important matters we possibly could have to deal with—the right of navigation of one of our principal rivers. I only regret that the hon. Minister did not take an earlier opportunity to express the views of the Government on this Bill, instead of waiting until an opposition had been created on this side of the House against it. But I am glad to see that they have awakened to the public interest, and will not allow the navigation of the Ottawa River to be obstructed in the interest of private individuals.

Bill withdrawn.

SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS.

Mr. BARRON (for Mr. WILSON, Elgin) asked, Has the Government of Canada sold Sultana Island, in the Lake of the Woods? If so, by what right or authority did the Government exercise the power of selling? To whom was the sale made? When was it made, and for what price?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A sale was made of a portion of Sultana Island, in the Lake of the Woods, containing 27·07 acres, at the rate of \$5 per acre, to Henry Bulmer, jr., Jacob Hendricks Henesy, Charles Alexander Moore, and Simmons Stuart Scoville. The sale was made under surrender dated the 8th of October, 1886, duly obtained from the Indians in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Act, the Island being a part of Reserve 38 B, which was set apart for the Indians under Treaty 3, made with them in 1873.

THE ALASKA BOUNDARY LINE.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the Government entered into any arrangement with the Government of the United States regarding the defining of the boundary line between the Territories of the Dominion of Canada and the Territory of Alaska? If such arrangement has been entered into, when and in what manner is the survey to be proceeded with? If such arrangement has not been entered into between the two Governments, are negotiations in progress looking to arrangements for the survey of the boundary line referred to?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Negotiations are in progress looking to an arrangement for the survey of the boundary line referred to, between Her Majesty's Government and the United States Government.