

HON. MR. POWER—Before that question is put I think it would be well that we should have some expression of opinion from the leader of the House. Recently that hon. gentleman has not been able to attend the meetings of the Railway Committee, and I think it desirable that someone should be there representing the views of the Government on the subject. I have understood that the Government are rather opposed to the construction of any further bridges across the St. Lawrence River, and I think before the House deals with this Bill we should have some information as to the position that the Government occupy with respect to it. Is this proposed bridge one of the structures to which they object, or is it not? The committee have a right to get some information on that point.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I am very happy indeed to give my hon. friend all the information that I can as to the views of the Government. Their objection is not in the abstract to making a bridge from one bank of the St. Lawrence to the other, but it is to making a bridge which will impede the navigation of the river. I understand that changes have been made to this Bill in another place which will prevent this bridge from being an obstruction to the navigation of the river—that is to say, its piers will stand on the main land, and it will be high enough to permit the largest vessels, with the highest masts, to pass under it. It will be higher than the Forth bridge.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It will be 20 feet higher.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Under these conditions, it cannot be in any way an obstruction to the navigation of the river, and the Government have ceased to make any objection to the Bill. I do not propose to make any objection to it here, and there cannot be any reason for opposing it, so long as the structure will not interfere with the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

HON. MR. POWER—I have to thank the hon. gentleman for the statement which he has made. It will greatly facilitate the work of the committee, now that they understand the views of the Government on the subject.

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

### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (121) "An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company." (Mr. MacInnes, Burlington.)

Bill (40) "An Act to incorporate the National Construction Company." (Mr. Kaulbach.)

Bill (39) "An Act to incorporate the York County Bank." (Mr. Vidal.)

Bill (128) "An Act respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company." (Mr. Reid, Cariboo.)

Bill (37) "An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada." (Mr. Clemow.)

Bill (92) "An Act respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to 'The Kingston, Napanee and Western Railway Company.'" (Mr. Read, Quinté.)

Bill (35) "An Act to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company." (Mr. Perley.)

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (97) "An Act to incorporate the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company, Limited." (Mr. Scott.)

Bill (98) "An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith. (Mr. MacInnes.)

### THE SAMUEL MAY RELIEF BILL.

#### THIRD READING.

HON. MR. MACINNES (Burlington) moved the third reading of Bill (16) "An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May."

He said: This Bill has been before the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, and its merits have there been fully established, so that there can be no doubt about it. It was unanimously passed by that committee, and with reference to the principle of such Bills, the House has already affirmed it by the passage of three Bills exactly such as these. One is the J. B. Smith relief Bill in 1869; another the James Macnab Bill in 1873; and the