

of the name of this company, to that of the English company, under the Imperial charter, namely, the "Royal" so well known in this and other countries. He thought it undesirable to sanction the use by new companies, no matter how respectable, of names of old ones long established, or names very like them. Thus confusion would be created, and injustice done deserving long established companies whose business might be withdrawn from them to some extent.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON said the honorable gentleman who had charge of the Bill, (Mr. Ferri r) was now absent. He did not think there was sufficient ground for objection to the proposed title.

The SPEAKER suggested that the honorable chairman of the committee might withdraw his report for the present.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU objected to this exception altogether, arguing there was no good reason for changing the title of the Bill. The proposed title, like the Company in question, belonged to the Dominion, there being none other under that name. The old company was an Imperial Insurance Company. The word Canadian constituted a sufficient difference and distinction, and the new company's name could not injure the old company, so well known in Canada and the United States. The new Company embraced many citizens of Montreal and had a large capital and a good standing. Every encouragement possible should be given Canadian companies, for we suffered much from the high rates imposed by foreign companies to recoup losses sustained elsewhere, such as the Chicago fire. Thus we should employ our own capital and save interest. Now, profits made in Canada by foreign companies went abroad. While allowing them every facility, we should not discriminate against our own Companies.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said the rule of the House was to prevent a second or new company using the name of an old one in operation. Otherwise, the one might be dealt with by mistake for the other, and the character which the old had established in the country might inure to the benefit of the new. It was only in view of such facts he had spoken, having no desire to prevent the establishment of a new Insurance Company. Quite the contrary. He was delighted to see Canadian companies flourish. The English or foreign companies doing business here paid a great deal of money in the country. Instead of making great profits, the business, he thought, had been rather a losing one. Those companies

had to invest large amounts in Dominion securities, and were entitled to fair play. The hon. gentleman said he would object to another Canadian Company calling itself the "Royal Canadian," and yet assented to this new one using the name of the old. It was only to the similarity in the names that he (Mr. Ryan) had any objection.

Hon. Mr. MCFARLANE said he saw no reason for this opposition. The distinction in the titles was quite apparent, and could scarcely lead to any confusion or mistake. He did not see why one company should have a monopoly of the word "Royal." He advocated the encouragement of Canadian companies, asserting that orders were sent out to raise the rates in Nova Scotia and Halifax after the Boston and Chicago fires, and it was with the utmost difficulty the people at the head offices, on the other side of the Atlantic, could be convinced they were taking a course injurious to their interests. Our people should be encouraged to invest their large surplus capital in undertakings like the present, while not interfering with or injuring foreign companies. He could see nothing in this name to induce us to change it. The word "Canadian" was a distinction ample for the protection of the English association.

After further discussion, in which Hon. Messrs. WILMOT, WARK, LETELLIER, DESJ. JUST and RYAN took part,

Hon. Mr. DICKSON stated the proceedings of the committee respecting this bill. He said, the petitioners were present, and after a good deal of discussion as to the title of the bill, the actual was agreed upon as proper and fair. They made a necessary amendment in committee.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON agreed with preceding speakers as to the importance of preventing such public inconvenience as would be occasioned by different companies using the same name. In this case he deemed the word "Canadian" a sufficient distinction, and one which would at once be noticed by the public. He hoped, therefore, his hon. friend (Mr. Ryan) would not consider it necessary to press his objection.

Hon. Mr. RYAN said that what had fallen from the chairman (Mr. Dickson) satisfied him, namely, that the committee had considered the bill. He could not, therefore, proceed with the objection, although he was still of opinion there was much similarity in the names, which would lead to confusion; still, in deference to the committee, he withdrew his objection.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. LETELLIER