

House and to give his view each one contradicting the other. It shows that when committees make reports they should give reasons for their judgments when they wish the honourable House to accept it. How am I to judge between the hon. gentlemen? Although I am opposed to the Bill—I think it is one against the best interests of this country, and is infringing upon the rights of the provinces—I believe from the evidence which I have in my hands, which is not contradicted, that it is an instrument of injustice, unless otherwise proved before the committee. I will make it my business to attend the committee, and hear evidence to destroy the impression made on my mind that this Bill is unjust. We have men who have immense interests in the country, stating that it will work a great injustice. We have the Monarch Lumber Company, the Thompson Lumber Company, saying that their rights are destroyed, and that their usefulness will be gone. I will ask the promoters of this Bill to say whether their assertions are true or false, and I will ask the committee if this parliament has a right to legislate on a question which—although I have not all the facts before me—is apparently within the purview and jurisdiction of the local legislature. These are facts of which we know nothing. We who are not members of the committee are allowed to go before the committee as spectators but not to discuss—we are allowed, but we are generally snuffed out, which is the result of these close committees—and get no information. The committee bring their report here without any authority whatever, when we know that out of the committee of forty sometimes we find a Bill adopted by a vote of 21 to 19. The minority on that committee have had no opportunity of giving the reasons why the vote is against the Bill. But the majority present their report through their chairman, and the Bill is passed. I say that is a fundamental error in our legislative system. We should give every senator an opportunity of knowing what is transpiring in the committee, and when the committee make their reports, the House should be in possession of all the facts regarding the case so that hon. senators who have had no opportunity to attend the meetings of the

Hon. Mr. CLORAN.

committee will be in a position to render judgment honestly, fairly and impartially on the floor of the House when the report is presented. That is my position, and on that ground, although opposed to the Bill in its present shape, I will vote that it be re-committed to the Railway Committee, in order that I may have a chance to hear the arguments which are advanced before that committee in regard to the Bill.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken will vote against referring the Bill back.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—If you give me good reason.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That is what I intend to do. The hon. gentleman states that he is not well posted, that the report of the committee does not set out the grounds on which the report was made.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—No, worse than that. The grounds stated are contradictory.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The report reads as follows:

The Standing Committee on Railways Telegraphs and Harbours to whom was referred B. (149), reports as follows:

The preamble of the Bill has not been proved to the satisfaction of your committee.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—One party says that, and the other says no.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The committee states that.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—The majority states that.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—They report as follows:

The grounds upon which your committee have arrived at such conclusion are that the legislature of British Columbia has full jurisdiction to incorporate such a company as that which the Bill seeks to incorporate, and to regulate the works and operations of the company in all respects, except in so far as they may interfere with navigable waters, as to which interference full provision is already made by Dominion statute.

All which is respectfully submitted.

Hon. Mr. WILSON—Was that one of the reasons for committing the Bill to the special committee? Were they to report on that, or to report on the Bill as a whole?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—They report upon the Bill as a whole. They say it is uncon-