

perfect safety for the public service ; and I have heard also that there is not business enough in Canada to have another line in competition to the two others. Therefore, we could not grant the new charter. As to the motion itself, I believe the Report should have been fuller than it has been made, and I do not suppose the hon. the First Minister will object to a motion that will refer the Bill back to the Committee.

MR. CASEY : I think, in reference to the contention of the hon. member for Halton, that the practice is pretty clearly laid down in Todd's book on Private Bill Practice. The whole question of expediency has been left to the Committee, and I think it would require, for such a motion as the hon. member has made, that he should adduce very strong reasons why the action of the Committee should be reversed, because his proposition involves a rather startling change in our practice in these matters.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) : The motion of my hon. friend from Halton is, that the Report be recommitted to the Standing Committee on Railways, with instructions to reconsider the Bill and report the same to this House. That motion, in the form in which it now stands, coupled with the reasons my hon. friend adduced in support of it, amounts to a direct reproof of the Committee for its action in this matter, and if we have to discuss this question on the reasons adduced by my hon. friend, a great deal can be said why the decision of the Committee should be upheld. With regard to the ground taken by the hon. member for West Durham, I understand his view to be that, under the General Rules when a Committee reports a preamble not proven, they should also report the reason why they think it is not proven. That Report was presented yesterday and received by the House, and I submit that it is too late now to send it back to the Committee, and that, in fact, it is not necessary to send it back for any such purpose ; because the only report they could make, judging from what we are led to believe occurred before the Committee, would be that they find it is not expedient to grant the prayer of the petition. There can be no doubt that the Committee came to the conclusion that it was not expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. LANGEVIN.

MR. BLAKE: That is what we want to know.

MR. CAMERON : I submit that it is not necessary to report any more than that they found the preamble not proven, because it was not expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. BLAKE : They have to state the grounds.

MR. CAMERON : It was never intended by that Rule that a Committee should enter into an elaborate statement of the *pros* and *cons* which induced them not to grant the prayer of a petition. All the Committee have to report, for the information of the House, is as to the part of the preamble which they think is not proven. The principle laid down by my hon. friend from Halton is, that there should be Free-trade in charters for telegraph companies. I think it is a very vicious and dangerous principle to lay down that we shall have Free-trade in any kind of charters, because the result will be that charters will be applied for and obtained without any intention of organising a company, but with the sole object of making money out of the sale of the charter. We have seen some legislatures granting charters indiscriminately, and then a regular set of men springing up who are promoters of companies and charter-sellers. They obtain a charter and then offer it for sale in the money markets of the world, or go to other companies established for like purposes and say : " If you do not buy this charter we will establish a company in opposition to you." They levy blackmail by using the powers Parliament has thought fit to give them. I trust that will be a practice we shall ever be reluctant to adopt, and that we will never grant a new charter to a company unless we are satisfied that it is in the public interest that the company should be established, and that the persons asking for the charter have a *bonâ fide* intention of organising their company under it. In this particular case we may presume, from what has been said here, that the Committee was of opinion that there were already sufficient telegraph companies chartered and in existence, that we have already chartered another company to carry on business in Manitoba and the North-West, and to extend their line to British Columbia, and that the telegraphic