

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I presume that if any amendment should be moved on Wednesday next my hon. friend will consider that he has notice of it.

HON. MR. MILLER—No; I should think any amendments to be moved on Wednesday should be placed on the Order Paper.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend is not reasonable on that point. I have asked for the postponement of the third reading in order that the Government may, tomorrow, have an opportunity to decide on this bridge clause. I cannot foresee what they may decide upon, whether to refuse permission to construct a bridge, or whether they will approve of it; and I am not, therefore, in a position to give notice of any amendment which it may be desirable to move on Wednesday next.

HON. MR. MILLER—I think the remarks of the leader of the House shows great laxity on the part of the Government on this important matter. The measure passed through the House of Commons, and no objection was raised to it there, though the Premier made a general objection to further bridging the St. Lawrence. I think it would be very wrong and a very unfortunate thing to permit any company to obstruct the navigation of the St. Lawrence to the extent that it would be obstructed below Quebec as this Bill contemplates. The promoter of the Bill says that unless he gets the clause providing for the bridge the whole scheme will fall to the ground. It would be a very easy matter at the third reading to move the six months' hoist if the Government object to the clause.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—That is what I propose to do on Wednesday next if the Government should come to the conclusion that they would rather not have another bridge across the St. Lawrence down there. All that I ask is, that I may be excused from placing on the Notice Paper any amendment that the Government may think it advisable to have moved at the third reading.

HON. MR. POWER—After the declaration made by the leader in a full House the promoter of the Bill cannot complain that he has no notice, and I do not think that any member of the House would raise a technical objection of that sort under the

circumstances. The rules are based on common sense, and it would be contrary to common sense to expect the leader of the Government in this House to give notice of an amendment when he does not know what the Government may decide to do. He has, however, notified the promoter of the Bill that he may find it necessary to move an amendment to this particular clause.

HON. MR. MILLER—If the rules are based on common sense they should be carried out.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The notice might be given on Monday.

HON. MR. LACOSTE—I shall have no objection if a motion is made on Wednesday without further notice, because I understand the only question affected is the power to build the bridge. Meanwhile, I will communicate with the members of my company and see what position we will take. I think an amendment to this clause would injure that grand scheme. It is necessary that our railway should have connections with the railway systems on both sides of the St. Lawrence. It is true there is a company now in existence which intends to build the bridge, but this charter was granted in 1887, and will lapse in the month of June next, and no power during the Session will be granted to the company—at least there is no Bill before the House. Under the circumstances, I think it is in the interest of this company to have the bridge clause, so as to be enabled to float bonds at once. The whole matter will be left in the hands of the Government. The Governor in Council will have the power to decide everything. If the other bridge is not built they might grant our company the right to go on and build a bridge.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Sufficient notice has been given that the amendment if made will be to the bridge clause.

HON. MR. MURPHY—I have no idea of frustrating this great enterprise by depriving the company of the right to build the bridge, but my instructions from Montreal are to this effect, that it is marvellous that such a Bill should have been before the House and the shipping interests should not have been informed of it. It is still more marvellous that it should have