

Mr. OLIVER—The ultimate intention, as announced by the Credit Valley Railway Company, was to make it a through road. We were told, when we granted our bonuses, that it was intended to connect with the Canada Southern at St. Thomas, so that we are not at all afraid that our local interests would be destroyed by making it a through road. I do not think that the amendment proposed by Mr. White will suit. After the word traffic, insert words to this effect, "or cars hauled by the Credit Valley Railway Company, and that in the event of the Credit Valley Railway being leased or sold to, acquired or worked by any other Railway Company, then in such case the running powers hereby acquired shall come to an end; but in the event of the Credit Valley Railway Company leasing or acquiring any other railway, then the tolls or compensation payable to the Northern Railway Company shall be subject to settlement by agreement, or, in case of dispute, by arbitration, as herein provided." Now, this amendment simply declares that, if the Credit Valley is merged into any other Company whatever, then this whole agreement shall cease, but in the event of the Credit Valley leasing or making traffic arrangements with provincial or other roads, then this whole arrangement shall be subject to re-settlement. I do not see that anything can be fairer. Then, in the event of the Credit Valley Railway Company making arrangements with the Canada Southern, or amalgamating these small provincial lines merging into this road, there shall be a reconsideration of the terms of agreement. But to make this whole arrangement cease if a small railway is merged into the Credit Valley, would be, I think, unwise and unfair. There is no use whatever in passing the Bill in its present shape. I, for one, should oppose it, not only here, but in the House, unless the Committee adopt some such amendment as I have suggested. It need not be in the phraseology of the amendment that I proposed, but they ought to provide that, as long as the Credit Valley Railway is an independent road, the company shall have liberty to continue this agreement, but the moment it ceases to be an independent road, the arrangement sanctioned by this Bill shall cease.

Mr. PLUMB—I have been greatly misunderstood by the gentleman who addressed the Committee with so much force a few moments ago. I never proposed or desired to limit the railway traffic coming into this country, and I say now, that I am perfectly satisfied that, in making an arrangement of this kind, we are making it for a local road. If the traffic of that road is to be enlarged, I say that the companies should be permitted to make a new arrangement. It should be distinctly understood how far the limitation of this clause goes. I am not to be thrown aside by any spread-eagle eloquence of any hon. gentleman. I am just as much in favor of increasing the traffic in this country as any hon. gentleman can be, and I have only risen to prevent a wrong impression from being made upon the Committee:

Sir ALBERT SMITH—Mr. Oliver thinks it is only right that this Credit Valley Railway Company should have the right to amalgamate with any other company without restriction.

Mr. CASEY—No; he says that they should have the right to absorb other roads.

Sir ALBERT SMITH—Suppose that they should absorb other roads until the traffic becomes too great for the capacity of the Northern Railway, should the Northern Railway have nothing to say or do about the matter? Why not let them come to Parliament if they want to make a new arrangement?

Mr. JONES (Leeds)—This clause, as I understand it, gives the Credit Valley Railway Company no right to use the yard of the Northern Railway, but simply the right to pass through it. The third clause gives large powers to the Northern Railway. They