

Maclean) has been fighting for for a very long time. And I think that he ought to be satisfied to wait and see what the effect of these concessions will be.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minister (Mr. Hyman) answer a question? It is here provided that any local company may use the Bell long distance system. But how is it provided that a subscriber to the Bell, wishing to use a connection with the local company, shall have the right to use it?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) will look at the clause, he will find that wherever any corporation authorized to operate a telephone system desires to use a long distance line controlled and operated by another company—

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But this is not a long distance line within the meaning of the Act, as it is not a service running between two exchanges.

Mr. HYMAN. Well, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) think that the local company will stand in its own light, and, while demanding the long distance connection with the Bell Company, refuse the Bell connection with its line?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is what the Bell Company is doing with other companies. This service is in its very nature reciprocal whether the companies be large or small. And the Act as originally intended, would have compelled reciprocal terms. The practice such a service works out in this way—each company receives about as much advantage as it gives. The small company is not a parasite on the large company, but tends to become absorbed in the large one. The Bell Company often says that, under reciprocal relations, the small companies benefit at the expense of the large companies, but I challenge the Bell or any other company to make good that statement by giving a single instance in support of it. Wherever it has been tried, it is found that, at the end of the month, the money relations between the two involve little or no payment on either side—that which each company has to pay just about cancels what it is to receive. I would also recall to the memory of the Minister of Public Works the instance I gave showing that if there is an arrangement for the interchange of business between two small companies having no trunk lines—

Mr. HYMAN. How could the connection be effected if there are no trunk lines.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Most of them want the interchange.

Mr. HYMAN. If they desire to interchange, there is no law to prevent them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the Bell Company is willing to make terms for interchange with the local company, if the local company will accept its terms. Otherwise, it treats the local company as an enemy and will not give it interchange of business. But there is any amount of evidence to show that the Bell Telephone Company is even anxious to give the long distance connection to the local company when the local company will accept its terms.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would the hon. gentleman mention the instances to which he refers?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Any number of them were given before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not think any were given.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Instances were given. Companies came here and said that they had been able to make terms with the Bell Company because they had surrendered their individuality and put themselves under the Bell Company. On the other hand companies declared they had been refused communication because they did not come to terms with the Bell Company.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the hon. gentleman submit the evidence to establish that point?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have not it at hand at this moment, but I can give it later on. I speak of cases coming within my own observation and that came up in the committee. While this amendment does give local companies the use of the long distance service, that is all it gives. It does not compel reciprocity of relations between telephone companies. Under this Act we have reciprocal relations of railways. The railways have undertaken to serve the people and all the people, and we arrange for unlimited interchange of service. This principle has been applied to the railways under this very Act and in the most sweeping manner. I ask the Minister of Railways to recall that clause which he has put in this Bill and which allows any railway company in this country to take possession of the right of way, the rails, the stations, the whole outfit of any other system, if the board gives them authority to do so. There never was such sweeping legislation introduced in any country as that clause which we have put in the Railway Act this session, or in connection with this very Bill, namely, compelling reciprocal service as between the two roads. Why? Simply because they are great public corporations, giving public franchises, and therefore they are compelled to serve the public every way. We have applied that principle to railways, why should we not apply it to telephone companies? Any telephone company can come to this House, and if they can show that they have sustained a damage, then the