

one year from the passing of this Act and completed within three years. I do not think that that is the intention of the promoter of the Bill. At the same time it is only fair to say that the hon. gentleman who was in charge of the Bill was perfectly willing to accept the amendment suggested in the committee, but his wish was over-riden by a majority of the committee. I also desire to call attention to the fact that in the second clause of this Bill there is what I look upon as being an ambiguity, which may lead to difficulty hereafter, so that, in my humble opinion, the better way would be to have the Bill referred back to the committee, to be amended generally. The first sub-clause of the second clause of the Bill begins as follows: "The bridge shall be a high-level bridge, and have not more than two piers located in the river, which piers shall not exceed each 40 feet at the surface of the water." Now, the Bill does not state 40 feet in what way. The intention is, I believe, that the pier shall not be more than 40 feet wide. When the company begin to construct the bridge they may, if they cover more than 40 superficial feet, be met with an injunction or some opposition which will interfere seriously with their enterprise. I think it would be wise to refer the Bill back to the committee and have it put into proper shape. It would be unwise to put the Bill through in its present imperfect shape to save a day now. The duty of this House is to correct hasty legislation from the other Chamber, and I think the wiser course would be to refer the Bill back to the committee.

HON. MR. MCKINDSEY—I do not think that my hon. friend is correct in saying that the majority of the committee were opposed to this amendment. I think otherwise; the majority said it was necessary, but the solicitor did not see the importance of it, and consequently the amendment was not made. What took place in the committee is probably not a proper subject of discussion in the Senate just now. The hon. gentleman spoke of the extension of time covered by this clause; that being embodied in this Bill as an original clause will extend the time as desired. Therefore, I can scarcely see how there is anything wrong in that clause. With respect to the 40 feet that

the hon. gentleman referred to, I do not see how it is possible that the clause can be misunderstood, because the next sentence after the one he quoted describes that there shall be a clear water way between such piers of not less than 1,000 feet and one opening of not less than 750 feet on each side of the main opening, and they shall be so placed as to best accommodate the navigation of the river. Therefore, the essential element in this Bill is to protect the navigation of the river. I discussed this matter with the promoter of the Bill, and he appeared to be willing to accept the amendment that I now propose, and I do not feel at liberty to adopt any other suggestion.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The suggestion made by the hon. member from Halifax is a very important one in the interest of the Bill itself.

HON. MR. MCKINDSEY—What is the proposition?

HON. MR. POWER—That instead of making the amendment proposed, the Bill should be referred back to the committee, so as to have it put into proper shape. The committee will meet to-morrow, so that there need not be more than a day's delay.

HON. MR. MCKINDSEY—I want to know what the objection is.

HON. MR. POWER—I have no objection to the Bill; what I desire is, that the hon. gentleman should get it in the best form.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill, as amended, was then read the third time, and passed.

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.'S BILL.

HON. MR. VIDAL moved the third reading of Bill (87) "An Act respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company." He said: It is not necessary generally that any explanation should be made at the third reading of a Bill of this kind; but in view of the circumstance that a notice has been given that certain amendments are to be proposed, I think it is desirable that I should express my opinion upon them as they are before the House. In the first place, I entirely and most heartily concur with every provision