

came to parliament in the same way they would not obtain authority unless they set forth distinctly where they were going to operate. Parliament never granted a charter on such broad lines before. You are giving this company absolute powers which you would give to no other company. They do not contemplate operating in the organized portions of the Dominion; why then should they hesitate to say so? It would be an extraordinary precedent for this House to set, to allow a charter to go through without defining where the company were to operate.

Then in regard to clause 9, which gives the company the right to carry on the business of a money forwarder by post or telegraph, let me ask would you give any other company that right in the settled parts of Canada? Certainly not, without saying between what points. It is only in these three cases I have asked to make any special change; and why the hon. gentleman should be forced to say that the company could not accept the Bill with these amendments, is beyond my comprehension. If you put that Bill on record without amending it, I do not see how you can refuse to grant to any other company the same privileges. It would be quoted against parliament. We are giving this company freedom to operate within the whole of Canada, because the word 'territory' cannot be interpreted as territories. If it were territories it would relate to those portions of Canada where there are no organized provinces; but it is wider than that, it is 'in the territory of Canada'. The territory of Canada extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and it extends southward to the American boundary line. You are going to give a right which you do not intend to give, which the company did not ask for, and which they do not propose to use. Why should not the language be made to conform to the intention of the company. It certainly cannot embarrass them. I do not desire in the smallest degree to take from them any power which they propose to exercise. All I desire to do is to prevent a very improper precedent being created. Under the Bill, as I proposed to amend it, they could operate all through the northern parts of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and in portions of the maritime provinces—those portions that are not under

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

municipal government. Is not that a pretty wide field? The company is essentially a fur company; that is the main object of their enterprise. They have, of course, many other powers. They can build and operate ships for the carriage of passengers and merchandise, construct telegraph and telephone lines; they have the right to speculate in timber limits, to erect saw-mills and to speculate in water powers and their accessories. We had here a day or two ago a water power Bill in reference to which inquiry was made with the greatest particularity as to where the water was going to be obtained, where it was going to be used, and what route was going to be taken, yet we are asked to give this company carte blanche. I do not desire to tie them up in any way; I only wish to limit the field of their operations as regards telegraph lines, carriage of mails, and transmission of money. You are going to supercede the postal money order office? We have express companies which have a special charter in order to issue money orders; but the company is to be allowed to issue money orders all over the country anywhere they like. They admit they want to send moneys from Toronto to Montreal, and other points. That is an innovation on the proper system of legislation, and if it is done you will have cause to regret it, because if you give such powers to this company you will be bound to give them to any other company. Then, under clause 11, the company may carry on business in Canada and elsewhere. They can go down to Mexico, to South America, all over the world. I do not think that is prudent legislation. I do not think it is going to serve or benefit the promoters of the Bill in any way, and it is going to create an extremely awkward precedent. I therefore move the first amendment of which I have given notice, in regard to clause 1.

Hon. Mr. TALBOT—I do not think the company can object at all to the amendment proposed by the hon. Secretary of State, provided it is understood that he is giving the correct definition of the term 'unorganized territories.' The expression would appear to cover only Keewatin and Mackenzie districts, which are not organized. The company's trading posts are mostly in the northern part of Alberta and