

them to this country when they obtained legislation in the name of taking away a monopoly. We have created a worse monopoly, because we have two instead of one. I do not know that an arrangement exists now. I have no authority for stating it; but I say what is published in the press, that it did subsist some months ago. So far from the Anglo-American company resenting interference with their rights, I understand at this moment the Government of Canada have their work done over the land and cable wires at half price.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—I think it is very unfair to represent that the legislation of last session was for the sake of the Direct Cable Company. Nothing of the kind took place. There was nothing about that company in the Bill, and the measure was passed because we believed it was in the interest of two continents, and of this Dominion especially, that this monopoly should be broken up. There is nothing about the Direct Company in the Act, and I do not believe that any gentleman voted for the measure that supported it for the sake of encouraging any special company, but to put all who might come into the field upon an equal footing. One hon. gentleman has told us that we now have two monopolies instead of one. I should like to know what difference the Act has made in the position of the two companies. The direct cable was in existence before the passing of the Act, and it is in exactly the same shape now. I am not aware that the direct cable crosses Newfoundland at all.

An hon. gentleman—It does not.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Then it may be said with perfect accuracy that we have done nothing at all to favour the Direct Cable Company. It is perfectly proper that any amalgamation, or any arrangement between the two companies as to cable rates, should be criticised and objected to; but we have nothing to do with that. If the Direct Company break on engagement, they break it with the public, not with us, for they have no engagement with us. As to the statement that there are now two monopolies, the hon. gentleman may rely upon it, if any disposition is shown to combine to the disadvantage of the public, the evil will shortly cure itself. Just as certainly as the companies are making a good thing out of their monopoly, just so certainly will some other company enter the field and compete with them, so that we shall eventually have fair play, which we could

not have had but for the legislation of last session.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACK—My hon. friend from Montreal thinks the legislation of last session will prevent a monopoly, but I contend that the amalgamation of these two companies will create a bigger monopoly, that will be so strong that it will deter other companies from going in to compete with them. I contend it will have that effect if they agree together for a working tariff over their lines. As to the Anglo-American Company having raised their tariff when the other company met with the accident, it is clearly shown by my hon. friend from Fredericton the necessity that the tariff of the Anglo-American Company should then be raised in the public interest in order to shut out unimportant correspondence when there was a pressure of business on their line. I had some ground on which to base the statement that there was an agreement as regards uniform rates of tariff. I have it from the public press, and I believe it is stated in the last annual report of the Anglo-American Company. My hon. friend from Arichat says when I moved to limit to fifty cents a word the maximum rate, that the tendency would be for the companies to keep their tariff at that figure as the estimate allowed by legislation. I fail to see how it could have that effect, but the hon. gentleman says there was another reason behind it; that it would give to the Anglo company a very strong claim on this Government for consequential damages in the event of their petitioning against the Government for having legislated away their vested rights. I do not see how he could say this would have made a claim for consequential damages, when he contended, and yet contends, that they were trespassers and intruders upon us. If they had no vested rights what possible means had they to come before this Parliament or before any legislature or court to ask for consequential damages in a matter in which he says they had no rights at all. I believe to the contrary, that they had vested rights, and always contended so.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—I agree with my hon. friend that a working arrangement between the two companies as to rates is very much the same as an amalgamation; but what I contend is, we never bargained with the Direct Company that it should do this, that, or the other. We simply bargained that the shores of the Dominion should be open to all companies who wished to land cables there. While it is