

that ought to be enough. Let the Government give as much land as they please in that country, but the people there must construct the road without any further aid from the central Government.

HON. MR. LACOSTE—I have listened, and I believe every member of this House has listened with very great interest, to the learned and clear statement made by the hon. gentleman from Shell River, and also to the valuable remarks which fell from the lips of the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken. Debates of this kind are not only interesting, but are also fruitful of good results. I have no doubt that the Government will weigh properly the reasons given on both sides; but in answer to the inquiry made by the hon. gentleman, I have to say that the Government have not yet come to any conclusion on this subject.

#### GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY'S BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

HON. MR. CLEMON moved the second reading of Bill (J) "An Act respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company." He said: The objects sought by this Bill are of a domestic character, rendered necessary by the fact that English capitalists have taken up this road and desire to have the number of directors increased. The existing Act restricts the number to five; this Bill proposes to increase the number to seven, with power to diminish the number at the option of the company. I am happy to inform the House that fifty miles of the road have been constructed and equipped, and that the company intend to complete the line in the spring, furnishing railway communication to the whole country between Brandon and Battleford. This road has been long sought for and desired by that important section of the country, and I am glad to be able to inform the House that the work is to be carried to completion in so short a space of time.

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

#### TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

HON. MR. MCKINDSEY moved the second reading of Bill (K) "An Act respect-

ing the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto." He said: The Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, by its Act of incorporation and amendments thereto, has power to hold property to the extent of \$500,000 and to create a bonded debt of \$300,000. The rapid increase of Toronto in population, and in the value and importance of the Board of Trade, renders it necessary that they should have a building for their accommodation which will cost more than the amount authorized by their Act of incorporation. They have purchased land in a very central part of the city and have commenced the erection of a very large building, and they ask by this Bill to be authorized to hold property to the value of \$750,000, and to exercise bonding powers to the extent of \$500,000, and to be allowed to issue first, second and third-class bonds, and to give a mortgage as collateral security for the payment of the bonds. The building which they are erecting will be a credit to the city of Toronto and in harmony with the public buildings which surround it. They also ask that the provisions of Cap. 127, Sec. 7, of the Revised Statutes of Canada shall not apply to the debentures or securities referred to in the Bill. They want to be able to call in the bonds at any time they may choose to do so, on giving notice in two of the Toronto daily papers. Last year the Board of Trade entered into an agreement with certain persons, who furnished money to purchase the land and erect the building which is now in course of construction. This agreement is made an appendix to the Bill for the purpose of ratifying it, and making it a portion of this legislation.

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

#### IMPROPER USE OF WEAPONS BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

HON. MR. READ (Quinté) moved the second reading of Bill (B) "An Act respecting the improper use of Firearms and other Weapons." He said: This is exactly like the Bill which passed through this House last Session. It being late in the Session when it went to the House of Commons it was not reached before prorogation. It is not necessary to explain the Bill; it was before the Senate last year, and was then discussed and thoroughly understood.