

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would call the attention of the leader of the opposition to the fact that the discussion in the Railway Committee was on a proposal to forbid the company amalgamating with the Canadian Pacific Railway without the consent of the legislature of the province of Manitoba. That did meet with disfavour, but, I think, under the circumstances, it was quite proper for the hon. member to ask that in the granting of the charter at the present time they should not ask power to amalgamate. If the conditions that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to prevail, the company can come here, give the reasons, and, if this House thinks it in the public interest, can be granted the power to amalgamate. At the present time, we are told by the promoters of the Bill, both parties are willing that this clause should be struck out. The parties with whom it has been suggested they may amalgamate, I suppose, are not asking that it should be put in. So, as many members of the House and the people, in that district think, they should have something to say with regard to the matter, and, while the people are asking railway accommodation and are willing to support this company, to get what they think is a competing railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we might easily allow this motion to pass unanimously and reserve for ourselves the right of future action.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) strengthens very much the case against our acting without referring the Bill to the Railway Committee, when he gives us to understand that the present charter gives them power which it is proposed to take away from them. I understand that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) has given notice that, on the third reading, he will move to refer the Bill back to the Railway Committee. That, I think, is the sound course.

Mr. TISDALE. Another important reason is, that it is a very unusual thing not to give this power. For the last ten years anyway, this has stood as part of what we call the model Bill. There is no reason why we should not change it if it is wise to do so. But this has usually been one of the formal clauses, the only question asked by the Railway Committee is with a view to restrain a company where they asked to name a road that does not touch their own. If it is to go back to the Railway Committee, I would consent, as there seems to be a bona fide objection.

Mr. SPROULE. As to my own opinion in this matter, I wish to say, if I could be convinced that this railway would remain for any length of time independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway and be a competitor with it, I would strongly support it. But my experience of a good many years in this par-

liament is that you cannot accomplish that. If this were a line parallel with the Canadian Pacific, it might be different, but it runs practically on three sides of a square crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway almost at right angles at several places. It was said in the committee that the main object of this road was to distribute coal to various farming districts. If that be the case, it is important that they should have the freest and most extensive running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway or else they should be amalgamated with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Bill reported.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I beg to move that this Bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, to strike out section 10, chap. 86, 53 Vic.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope that referring this Bill back to the committee will not necessarily be limited to passing the motion exactly as the hon. member has made it.

Mr. TISDALE. They would be limited to this particular subject, of course. It defines what the committee will do, this is the only thing that can be done.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not know whether it was definite enough.

Mr. SPEAKER. As a matter of fact the resolution will cover his amendment which he proposes to submit and no other.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No 34), respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). In connection with this motion, I desire to bring up the general question of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do you propose bringing it up before we go into committee?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, the Premier is in the House, and I wish especially to call his attention and the attention of the government to this matter. Now, the legislation proposed in this Bill is of a very important character, it is practically giving the Canadian Pacific Railway power to build 1,200 miles of railway. The government have laid down the policy that for the future they intend to demand concessions from every railway obtaining powers from this parliament, and especially have they laid it down in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Some years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway was given very large powers