

was before the committee, the general borrowing powers were struck out. The Dominion Guarantee Company have erected a building in the city of Montreal, and so it has become necessary for them to borrow the sum of \$55,000. The Bill legalizes and declares valid that mortgage, but does not give the company power to borrow the money that may be necessary in the event of their being called upon to pay off the mortgage. I shall ask leave to introduce the Bill and would request the House to give it its first and second readings that it may be referred to committee. I have the enacting clause of the Bill here, though I have not it in the form of a Bill.

Mr. PRINGLE. I now move for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose this Bill is introduced by my hon. friend in consequence of the amendment which was made in the Senate to the Bill which he has just brought under consideration.

Mr. PRINGLE. Yes. I was under the impression that we could have made the amendment which was inserted here. The Senate refused to make it, considering they had not power to do so. So they sent the Bill back here, and in having the matter looked up by the officials, they advised me that the proper course was to introduce a short amending Bill instead of asking for this amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is aware that such a Bill at this stage is very irregular. At all events no harm will be done if we read it a second time and send it to the committee, where it can be considered. We can go no further than that to-day.

Mr. PRINGLE. That is all I ask, that it be sent to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

#### QUESTIONS.

##### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — PICTOU BRANCH.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. When the Pictou branch portion of the Intercolonial Railway was transferred from the Halifax and St. John district to the Sydney and Oxford district, were instructions given that the employees on the Halifax portion of the line would not be affected by its transfer?

2. Have any changes been made that have affected the employees on said portion of the road? If so, at whose solicitation, and why were not the instructions carried out, if any were issued?

3. If these changes were made, what advantage have they been to the line?

4. How much more has it cost the railway

monthly since the change, such as paying employees who are taken off their trains before their trip is ended, and also paying them passenger time between Truro and Stellarton?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The late Hon. Mr. Blair, then minister gave instructions February 28, 1898, as follows: 'The Truro and Stellarton section is to be transferred to the Sydney and Oxford district, on the 1st March, but the same trainmen and enginemen, who have been working that road, are to continue to do so, if they so desire.' The above arrangement, was not satisfactory to the trainmen and enginemen at Stellarton, who requested that the matter be referred to the Brotherhood, which was done, and in March, last, the minister instructed the general manager, as follows :

2. That the Truro men who are at present manning trains on the Stellarton-Oxford district be transferred to that district, and in the event of any of these men not wishing to do so, an equivalent number of men should be transferred from the Truro district with equal rank; and that trains Nos. 17 and 18, from New Glasgow to Halifax, shall belong entirely to the Truro crew. In case of vacancies occurring, these trains shall be manned by Truro men, and that for all future purposes of promotion, the Halifax, Truro district and the Stellarton, Sydney and Oxford district be separated as distinct promotion districts; choice of men affected to be made at the next change of time or within thirty days from date. Crews of trains Nos. 17 and 18, are to be given train home and return at week's end, if business warrants as in the past. These instructions were carried into effect in April last.

3. The department was of the opinion that the changes would be in the interests of the railway.

4. There is nothing to show that it increases the cost of operating the railway.

##### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—AMQUI STATION.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What was the amount voted to defray the cost of construction of the Intercolonial Railway station built at Amqui in 1904?

2. What amount was actually expended in the construction of the said station?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. There was an appropriation of \$12,550 for increased accommodation at Amqui, voted in 1904-5; but this appropriation provided for other work in addition to building a station.

2. The amount expended in building the station at Amqui, was \$6,460.50.