

Great Western Railway. Mr. Swinyard's objections were stated under the following heads:—

1. The proposed extension for almost its entire length, is a competing line with existing railways. Mr. Swinyard stated that from the Niagara River to Dunnville, the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway now runs along the lake shore, leaving a very narrow strip of land, on which the Erie and Niagara extension could be built; that from St. Thomas to Amherstburgh or Windsor, a distance of one hundred and four miles, the Great Western Railway runs within an average distance of about seventeen miles of the lake shore; that the construction of another railway between these places would be a most wanton expenditure of money; and that it would be an act of injustice to the existing lines to authorize the construction of a railway of over two hundred miles in length, and which for over one hundred miles of that length would run parallel to, and in immediate competition, with the Great Western.

2. The territory south of the Great Western Railway is utterly inadequate to sustain a railway of the character of the proposed Erie and Niagara extension.

3. A line running the entire length of the peninsula, as proposed by the Erie and Niagara extension, is not the best way of affording railway facilities to that portion of the district which requires additional railway accommodation. A line running north and south, connecting with the existing railways, was, in Mr. Swinyard's opinion, the true mode of serving the territory lying between Dunnville and Brantford on the east, and London and Port Stanley on the west.

4. The accommodation of through traffic is not a sufficient reason for the Ontario Legislature to charter new lines of railway, to the injury of existing Canadian enterprises.

5. Influence of railway investments upon the general credit of the Province, and importance of doing nothing to injure them.

6. Improbability of the necessary capital being obtained to construct this road; and duty of Parliament to inquire specially into this point.

7. Granting rival railway charters does not necessarily ensure competition and greater accommodation to the public. As a rule, Mr. Swinyard stated, the construction of rival railways resulted in combination.

Mr. HECTOR CAMERON appeared in opposition to the scheme, on behalf of the Hon. Isaac Buchanan, a petitioner against the Bill. He read a statement by Mr. W. Lynn Smart, Parliamentary Agent for Mr. Buchanan, which set forth—That the powers granted to Mr. Buchanan and others, by an act of the Province of Canada, to construct a railway between the Niagara and Detroit rivers, had not yet expired. That the petitioner and others subscribed for stock in the Niagara and Detroit rivers railway company, paid in \$120,000, being 10 per cent. on the subscribed capital, commenced surveys, and

let their contract for the construction of the railway. That the petitioner had previously lent money to the said company, for which he held a judgment—the amount now due him thereon being \$119,620. That the Erie and Niagara Company are in great pecuniary difficulties, and are not in a position to satisfy the committee as to the cost of the proposed railway, nor of their ability to construct the same. That the petitioner and others associated with him ought to have an extension of the time named in their charter granted to them, rather than that the powers sought by this Bill should be conferred on the Erie and Niagara Company. That this Bill is indirectly a repealing of the Charter of the Niagara and Detroit Rivers Company, which is excluded from the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. O'REILLY, Q. C., appeared for Mrs. Morton, widow of the late Mr. Morton of Kingston; and, in allusion to a portion of Mr. Cameron's argument, stated that he had found, by the evidence of Mr. Morton's papers, that it was Mr. Morton's money which paid for the plans and surveys, for which Mr. Buchanan took credit. He stated also that, at Mr. Morton's sale, these were bought in by Mr. Buchanan for £1,000.

Mr. W. A. THOMPSON, of Niagara, the chief promoter of the Bill, appeared on behalf of the Erie and Niagara Company, and spoke forcibly in favour of the Company being allowed to proceed with the proposed extension.

Mr. STRONG, Q. C., also addressed the committee on behalf of the Erie and Niagara Company.

A deputation from St. Thomas was also present.

Sheriff MUNRO spoke shortly on their behalf, stating that the feeling of the section of country around St. Thomas was unanimously in favour of the Erie and Niagara extension.

The committee, after deliberation, agreed almost unanimously to adopt the preamble of the Bill, and will meet again on Monday to consider the details of the Bill, clause by clause.

The committee adjourned at one o'clock.

NOVA SCOTIA.

OPENING OF THE LEGISLATURE.
