

tions are public property. The new company can get them at the registry office if they are required; they can go to the Public Works or to the Railways Department and get all the plans or specifications of the old company. The old company cannot keep them back; they are there. I think that under these circumstances they really have a fair claim to consideration, and that this amendment ought to meet with the sanction of this chamber.

HON. MR. READ (Quinté)—It seems to me that a new doctrine has just been laid down by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat—that bad legislation can be easily obtained in the other branch of the Legislature. To my mind that is a very serious and sweeping assertion. I consider that most of the people who have Bills before Parliament do not find that it is so easy to obtain the sanction of the Legislature, and while it might be easily obtained in the Commons, it certainly is not easily obtained here; for this Bill—I may say to hon. gentlemen who, perhaps, do not know the history of it—has been three times passed by the other branch of the Legislature and twice refused by the Senate. The duty of this House is to prevent hasty legislation, and I think that in this instance it has certainly performed the functions that devolve upon it. It is a strange thing that this resolution should be brought in at this late stage of the Bill. We heard nothing of it before the committee. Nothing of this sort was suggested where it could have been discussed and properly inquired into. The committee reported without a division, and I think I am not out of order in saying so; consequently this is a very late hour to bring forward a motion to load down this Bill with \$15,000. The company that asked for this money was incorporated by Act of Parliament in 1882. Their charter was further amended in 1884, the work to commence in 1887 and be completed in 1890. As yet there has been no work of construction done. There was a subsidy granted in 1885, work under it to be commenced in 1887, and the road to be finished in four years—in 1891. Now, we have it on the best authority that the subsidy has lapsed, and that the road is stricken out of the list of railways to which subsidies have been

granted. I have now before me evidence to that effect. The subsidy is lost, the charter is lost, and the hon. gentleman is simply preventing another company from constructing a road which is demanded by the public in the counties through which it passes. I have now before me a resolution passed by the corporation of the city of Ottawa during the present year. The city of Ottawa rather sympathized with the old company, and last year passed a resolution in their favor. I have now in my hand a resolution passed by the corporation of Ottawa a few weeks ago, which is as follows:—

“Moved by Alderman MacLean, and seconded by Alderman Henderson, that this council having heard the communication of Dr. Dickey, M. P., in reference to the application for a charter on behalf of the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company, and the opinion of the Honorable the Minister of Justice in regard to the charter of the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway Company, and recognizing the importance to this city of the early construction of a line of railway such as the one now contemplated, would respectfully urge upon the House of Commons and Senate of Canada the advisability of granting a charter to the present applicants.

“And that this council, in view of the fact that nothing has been done by the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway Company to preserve their charter during the past year, hereby rescinds the resolution passed by this council on the 25th day of March, 1889, with reference to the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.—Carried.

JACOB ERRATT,
Mayor.

Signed,
Wm. P. LETT,
City Clerk.

[Seal].

I have also another petition from the county of Carleton, through which this road is to pass, upon the same subject. I have also a petition from the township of West Winchester; also one from East Winchester; also one from the township of Osnabruck, and one from the township of Gloucester, which I would read only it would weary the House to do so. Now would it not be hard to refuse a charter to this company in the face of all these petitions, or to load the charter down with something that is of no use to it all? If the plans and specifications are of any value the proper time to have brought up a claim for them was before the committee, where it could have been discussed, where all parties could have been heard, and the validity of the claim inquired into, and not at this last stage of the Bill. I may say that I have the opinion of the Minister of Justice—which it is as well to read,