

ing Thursday, which was the date of the adjournment, and in their wisdom (for I must assume was what assume they did they considered was wisely done though I might differ therefrom) they refused to let the matter stand until Mr. Davis returned. On his return to Ottawa he requested me to ask this honorable House to permit the Bill to be recommitted to the committee, so that he could express his views upon it. It seems to me that this consideration is involved in the motion, namely, when a promoter of a Bill brings it before a committee of the House he should be given an opportunity to explain to the committee the objects of the Bill. The committee on that occasion was not assisted by the representations which Mr. Davis could have made, and, I am disposed to think, had not placed before them that measure of information which it was their desire to have in connection with the measure. The Bill is evidently fraught with a certain amount of importance to its promoters and to the particular district in which it is the intention to carry on the operations referred to in the Bill.

I think hon. gentlemen present should take into consideration that in such a matter as this the public interests would be best served by hearing what the promoter of the Bill may have to say upon this particular question. I do not intend upon this occasion to deal with the merits or demerits of the Bill. I think this question should be taken into consideration entirely apart from that—that we should divest ourselves entirely of the view as to whether this Bill is possessed of merits or not, for this, I submit, cannot be very well considered on this occasion in the House, nor can it be done by hearing the *ex parte* views of delegates on one side; but the views of both parties should be presented before the committee. I therefore move the motion which has been placed upon the Paper, that this Bill be recommitted, for the purpose of hearing Mr. Davis on the matter, so that if his views should appear to be consonant with what might be deemed the public interest, that the measure should be restored to the Order Paper, so that it may come before this House again in due course.

Hon. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend says that he does not propose to go into the facts of this case, and he gives the

House no ground on which he desires a reconsideration of this Bill. I do not, therefore, propose to go into the facts of the case at present, but I shall submit to hon. members a preliminary objection to this motion being entertained upon grounds which I think will recommend that proposition to the good sense of the House. My hon. friend has correctly stated that when the Bill came up from the House of Commons he asked as an indulgence that it should be read at once a first and second time, on the same day, and the rule was dispensed with, in order to accommodate the hon. gentleman; and the reason he gave for it at the time was, that the mayor and some of the corporation of Calgary were in attendance, for the purpose of opposing this Bill, and he desired to give them an early opportunity of appearing before the committee. In consequence of that they did appear; they were heard, plans were submitted, the whole question was gone into, and a very strong, almost a unanimous opinion was expressed against the Bill, and a report was, in consequence, submitted by me, as it was my duty to do, as chairman of the committee, to this effect:

“Your committee find that the preamble of the said Bill has not been proved to their satisfaction, and your committee have arrived at such decision on the ground that the passing of the said Bill would be against the public interest.”

This was on the 26th March, and is signed by myself as chairman. On motion of myself, seconded by Hon. Mr. Power, that report was adopted by the House, and, therefore, there is an end of the Bill. My hon. friend does not propose to rescind the solemn action of the House, when they declared it was a Bill against the public interest—that the preamble had not been proved—but he proposes coolly to refer it back again to the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors, although the House has solemnly disposed of it. In all good nature I will say that the committee scarcely ever meet without having new business to do, without being asked to reconsider business that they have already disposed of, and on which the House has sanctioned our action. Therefore, that ought to be a sufficient reason for the House not entertaining this motion at all. I am perfectly prepared to show by the most cogent reasons, if it is necessary, that this is a motion which should not be entertained—for the reasons that are given