

plained of was that the parties who apprehended injury in this matter had not been present to state their case. This bill was of the hybrid species, and required a notice in the interest of the private rights. If the stockholders had no rights, as argued, there was no harm in allowing a protection clause. The House had no information as to whether they had rights or not. For his part he believed they had not. He did not desire to assume their existence, and protect them, but to avoid the wrong of a kind of legislation injuriously affecting those rights. The rights they proposed to take away were given by other people. The Secretary of State had said there was a clause protecting all rights. He (Mr. P.) would like to see it. (Hear, hear)

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The 16th.

Hon. Mr. PENNY argued it afforded no protection to any rights of the Company. He would rather strike out that clause altogether. What had we to do with the coats of any other country than our own? (Hear, hear.) If there were any rights in existence, they were not protected by this clause.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the effect of the bill was to put all parties on an equal footing.

Hon. Mr. PENNY observed, the fact was it took away a monopoly, to which he had no objection so far as that was concerned. He did not want any clause to protect rights that did not, but those that did exist. Let monopolies be removed by fair means. When he saw the 16th clause, instead of being what it pretended, it was one apt to deceive, under the pretence of protecting some party's rights, while it protected nothing at all; he was prepared to vote against it.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL in a humorous strain criticised some features of the Bill which he thought objectionable. Though he did not like monopolies he found fault with the haste exhibited in the promotion of this Bill. The company had not had time to prove their vested rights in the shores of this Dominion. The Government were pushing the measure with somewhat indecent haste. [An ironical cheer.] He believed the company had no legitimate rights whatever. The Government's action gave colour to the suspicion that there was something beyond actual appearances. He would vote against the Bill.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said the proceedings in regard to the Bill had excited his suspicions, and he would vote against it.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER related what took

place in the Committee. A delay was granted till Tuesday, 19th, to allow interested parties to appear and be heard. None came and the Bill was passed by a large majority. It was intended to protect the Dominion against this powerful telegraph monopoly. There was no monopoly in the interest of any province of the Dominion, and it was not desired a Newfoundland monopoly should extend itself to the Dominion. That one was so strong as to influence the Legislature of the Island and even defy it and the Government through Cyrus Field, an American. Without that monopoly, the Island politics would have exhibited a different character and results. He would be sorry to attack the vested rights of any company; but this Bill did not. It enabled other companies to be formed under certain regulations, and participate in the privileges now enjoyed by the present company, so as to enlarge and cheapen the telegraphic facilities of the Dominion, and relieve it from the dependence upon a mischievous monopoly. Because such bodies might render services, their powers were not always to be increased. The 16th clause, instead of being useless, would prove of great advantage. He hoped the Bill would pass.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD remarked that harm might be done by such legislation, in driving telegraph companies away from Nova Scotia, to other routes.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL did not think the bill should pass in its present shape. Under certain circumstances they should legislate against monopolies. At present they were asked to do away with a monopoly in Newfoundland—with a very exceptional thing, and in a very exceptional way. As his hon. friend from Alma (Mr. Penny) put it, correctly and logically, the bill was a private one, and yet it was introduced by the Secretary of State in the category of public bills. It must have been introduced in that shape for some object—a bill having for its avowed object the abolition of a monopoly. (Hear, hear.) The hon gentlemen who represented the Government, affirmed and re-affirmed it was not intended to interfere with existing rights. If so, why object to the amendment designed to make that perfectly clear? The gentlemen who laid their telegraph wires from England to this country, landed them in Nova Scotia, and had used them for 20 years. Assuming they had no statutory right, they might have some other right. We do not know that a power was not given by the Imperial Legislature to land those wires in that Province, there being no record of