

by building over a large extent of territory, which they find north of that Island, they would be able to reduce very materially the rate of insurance which they are paying in Ottawa and Hull, where there is a little space for mills. In the second place, they say they would be able to use the sawdust in supplying their furnaces, as they intend to run their machinery by steam instead of water power, and they would at once get rid of a nuisance that is very seriously felt in the district of Ottawa and elsewhere. In the third place, they say they would almost be able to pay the wages of their men from the sale of edgings and scraps in the city of Montreal. Finally, they point out a great many other advantages that would arise from building mills near a great commercial centre and seaport like Montreal. The cost of transportation of lumber in logs being about four-fifths less than under the present mode; manufactured lumber would be made cheaper in Montreal. I need not say that if such a scheme were realised, it would be of great advantage, not only to my constituency, but also to the Island of Montreal generally, and to the whole trade of Canada. For the purpose of establishing that industry, the promoters want booming powers, not from Ottawa to Montreal as is mentioned in the Bill, and which is the very serious objection to it and to which I cannot give my consent personally—they do not ask, I say, to boom the river from Ottawa to Montreal, but, as I ascertained in the interview with the promoters, they want simply to boom the foot of the Carillon Rapids, so as to be able to catch loose logs that come down. The promoters will take those logs, tied together, above and below those rapids to the channel north of the Island of Montreal, where they want to build another boom. These are the only two points where they wish to have power to construct booms. Of course, in so booming the river, the promoters desire to give compensation to all riparian proprietors and all persons who may suffer either at the time of the construction of the boom or at any time subsequently. The promoters propose that the plans, according to which the booms will be constructed, shall be laid before the House; and not only so, but that those booms shall remain under the absolute control of the Government, and be open to the public, and be constructed at the cost of the promoters. Another condition in regard to the construction of the booms, which they are willing to insert, is that the boom shall not in any way whatever obstruct the navigation of the river, either at the Carillon Canal, or at any other place. It is not surprising, considering that the Bill does not set forth exactly the true purpose and object the promoters had in view, and considering the very extensive powers asked by this Bill, that a serious agitation should have taken place in the country along the Ottawa River, and among the forwarders, and even in the board of trade of Montreal, which looked with alarm at the booming of the whole river from Ottawa to Montreal. The Bill was not framed by me, and was not introduced by me. I objected to it from the beginning, but I consented to take charge of it in the House, on the condition that, after receiving the second reading, it should be modified in the Committee of Railways and Canals, to which I intended to move its reference. But, considering the strong feeling which has been shown in the House against the Bill by the number of petitions presented against it, I fear this course cannot succeed; and for these reasons, with notice to the House and the country that the Bill will be presented another Session with the necessary modifications, in order that its true nature and purpose shall not be misunderstood, I move for leave to withdraw the Bill, and that the Order be discharged.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has adopted the course he has just taken with respect to this Bill, a Bill more detrimental to the prosperity of the country and to the interests of free navigation, I can scarcely

imagine it is possible to introduce, for this Bill asks for the promoters power to practically boom the river from the Chaudière Falls to the Island of Montreal. I hope we are not so dead to the interests of justice that we will give away these rights over the largest tributary of the St. Lawrence, as this Bill contemplates. It is amazing to me that a Bill of that kind should be presented to this House, and that we should be expected to sanction and confirm it. Sir, I am glad the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has withdrawn his Bill, but I am sorry that he indicates that he will bring it up again next year. Let me make a few suggestions to my hon. friend. There is no one here who desires to prevent any one to have every proper facility to carry on manufacturing industries, and particularly that one of our principal industries, the manufacture of saw-logs. If they want to move their mills from further up the Ottawa River to the back of the Island of Montreal, in order to obtain the advantages that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) points out, it is a very proper thing for them to do, but they can do that without any Bill of this kind whatever. They can obtain the right from private individuals to put up their mills, and they can get from the Government permission to extend their booms for commercial purposes without any such Bill as this, which would give the monopoly of the whole river. There is no reason why they should put up a boom below the Carillon Falls to interfere with the navigation, not alone of steamboats, but of the barges which float the lumber from here to New York. What the gentlemen connected with this company should do is to make up their minds what property they require, and then go to the owners of that property and make a private arrangement for the purchase of it if they can; but they do not require to come to this House to ask us to give them the entire control over that great tributary of the St. Lawrence system. It is an outrage that such an application should be made, and I am glad that my hon. friend sees the folly of it. Since he has now withdrawn the Bill, I hope he will not bring it up again next Session.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I am glad that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has withdrawn this Bill, but I regret that he announces his intention of bringing it up again, for it is certainly one of the most outrageous pieces of legislation I ever heard of. This Bill proposes to give to a private company the possession of the River Ottawa between Ottawa and Montreal; and not only will it give them power to take possession of the river, but also possession of the properties alongside of the river. I am still more surprised to see this Bill supported by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), because he is in a better position to know the objections to this Bill than any other member in this House. He does not forget—for it is not very long since he obtained a judgment in damages—and I think a very good judgment it was—against an owner who moored a raft for a few weeks in front of the property of my hon. friend. If this Bill passed, every property owner on the Ottawa River might be deprived of the view of the river from his residence, and of all the advantages of living alongside of this beautiful stream, and he could get no compensation, because this company would say that they were empowered by the Ottawa Government to build booms, or wharves, or anything they pleased along the river. There are a great number of very fine country residences, belonging to parties in Montreal, on the Ottawa River, and immense booms might be stretched in front of those fine properties, so as to render them perfectly worthless. My hon. friend, who obtained damages from the owner of the raft, knows this very well too. I do not remember the name of the person against whom he obtained the damages, but the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) will remember