Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The sum granted in consideration of fire protection was included in the $60,000 paid under the old Act. This provides for the increasing of that $60,000 grant to $100,000, and $15,000 in addition.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I speak from recollection, and the hon. gentleman from Ottawa can correct me, but I rather think that is held as a separate thing.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—It was taken into account; but there was no special amount paid for that particular service under the original agreement. It was one of the things urged upon the government in making the original grant, although no special provision was made.

The clause was adopted.

Hon. Mr. BOYER, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill (No. 32) An Act to amend the Government Railways Act.

The Bill was read the first time.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the second reading of the Bill.

He said: The object of this Bill is chiefly that if a loss has been sustained for which the government is liable, and it should prove that a considerable or any amount of insurance had existed on the property destroyed, that the claimant would be obliged to account for the insurance, or deduct it from the amount he would recover from the government. Apparently it would prevent the parties being paid twice over.

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

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—This only applies to government railways.

Hon. Sir RICHARD SCOTT—Yes.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is there a like provision in the Railway Act governing cases of this kind with regard to railways which are not government railways?

Hon. Sir RICHARD SCOTT—No, there is a limitation so far as government railways are concerned, that no larger verdict than $5,000, under any circumstances, shall be obtained, and that if the party sustaining the loss has his property insured, the amount paid him under his policy would be deducted.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is there a similar Act governing the Canadian Pacific railway or any other railway?

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—The government are not responsible at all by statute law.

Hon. Sir RICHARD SCOTT—That would be matter of evidence. The defendant company would go into court and the jury would take that into consideration in awarding a verdict, but there is no statute defining that condition.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That is a very good explanation; but if the jury would deduct the amount of insurance that was upon the property destroyed by the Intercolonial railway, why would the same principle not apply to a claim for damages by parties whose property was destroyed by sparks from locomotives of a company railway?

Hon. Sir RICHARD SCOTT—While the statute defines that the government must get credit for the amount of money paid by the insurance company to the claimant, yet in a case against the Canadian Pacific railway or any other railway, if under the General Railway Act, of course the company would give evidence that the plaintiff's property was insured up to a certain sum, and no doubt any intelligent jury would take advantage of that in giving