

of the country, but we are not convinced that the mere construction of lines of railway will always insure competition, and we, therefore, think that the time to safeguard public interests, is when we are granting the charters. This line of railway was originally chartered to the extent of seventeen miles, and was given 6,400 acres per mile, or in all 108,800 acres, which at \$3 per acre, are worth \$326,400. They are now asking authority to extend their line, and therefore before giving them this privilege, we should see that the public are properly protected. My experience is that if you do not safeguard the interests of the people when these companies ask for charters, you cannot do it nearly so well afterwards. The Manitoba and North-western was supposed to be an independent line, and so was the Great North-western Central, but they are now in the hands of the one corporation. I am not saying a word against the corporation which has acquired control of these roads, and which is no worse and no better than any other great corporation, but it is not right that the whole country should be placed under the control of any corporation, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). I may state that I am quite agreeable to the suggestion of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), being carried out. I think that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), was hardly fair in the reference he made to his own amendment the other day, because there is a difference between the amendment he proposed, and the one before the House. His amendment was objectionable in this respect, that it would be an expression on the part of this House in favour of introducing a clause of that kind into isolated charters. But, the present amendment, which asks that the section be eliminated from the charter, will prevent any misconstruction of that kind being put on the action of the committee. Knowing that the promoters of this Bill have no intention of amalgamating with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other railway—they advised me from the very first that they had no such intention—I see no objection to the motion carrying.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I do not quite concur in the suggestion made by the hon. the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland). I would draw his attention to the fact that it does not appear to quite carry out the views of the Railway Committee. In that committee the suggestion was made by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), that a motion of this kind should be adopted, but that suggestion received no support whatever. The Railway Committee appeared to be unanimous

Mr. ROCHE.

against this very proposal. If that committee is of any utility at all, it is useful for the consideration of just such questions as this, and instead of having this motion sprung suddenly on the House, we should have it brought up in the committee where parties can be heard on both sides. If the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), would allow the Bill to pass through the committee here as it has gone through the Railway Committee, and then move, on the third reading, to refer it back to the Railway Committee to consider the point now raised, it seems to me that would be a much more satisfactory way of proceeding, than to adopt this motion now. If he would allow the Bill to pass through committee here as it came from the Railway Committee, and then, on the third reading, move to refer it back to the Railway Committee to consider that question, I think it would be much better than to spring this on the House without it having received the consideration of the Railway Committee, especially so because, when the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), raised this question in the Railway Committee, he received no support.

An hon. MEMBER. That is what is proposed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I understand that it is intended to move on the third reading to refer this back to the Railway Committee, I have not a word to say.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is, no doubt, somewhat mistaken, as to what occurred. No doubt the matter was dropped when it came up in committee from the remark I made, in which the hon. gentleman concurred, that the company had no power to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This, no doubt, influenced many members of the committee. But on Friday evening, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) brought the original charter and called my attention to the fact that they had this power to amalgamate.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I remember asking in the committee if all the railways they wanted mentioned were mentioned, and I think that is in the new Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) is mistaken. We were asked to put a clause in this Bill forbidding them to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company without the consent of the legislature of Manitoba.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) will allow me—I offered to amend that so as to make it read—without the consent of the Governor in Council.