

we have not refused to permit the increase of such enterprises. The hon. member for Halton remarked that this company could obtain a charter without coming to this House. It can, but of a limited character, under chapter 66 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, but that would practically be of no use, as the power only extends to Ontario and Quebec. In the meantime, I shall support the motion of the hon. member for Halton, on the grounds I have stated, for referring the Bill back to the Committee, but the hon. member should strike out the instructions to the Committee.

MR. BLAKE: I do not want to express any opinion on the merits of this Bill, but it seems to me such a course is not possible under our rules, except that this Bill should be referred back to the Committee. Unless upon the assent of the promoters of the Bill, I apprehend it is not possible for a Committee consistently with the rules and their duties, to make a report of that description.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria): The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill made the motion in the usual way, and it was upon his request that it was done.

MR. BLAKE: We do not find any statement that this was done upon consent. In reference to this matter Rule 65 provides:

"When the Committee on any Private Bill report to the House that the preamble of such Bill has not been proved to their satisfaction, they must also state the grounds upon which they have arrived at such decision; and no Bill so reported upon shall be placed upon the Orders of the Day, unless by special order of the House.

"2. Private Bills, otherwise reported to the House by such Committee, shall be placed upon the Orders of the Day following the reception of the Report, for consideration in Committee of the Whole, in their proper order, next after Bills referred to a Committee of the Whole House."

If there was assent it ought to have been reported to us. Unless by assent, there were but two ways of dealing with it, either to report the preamble proved, and the clauses adopted with modification, or without, and to report the preamble not proved, and in that case to give the reasons why the preamble was adjudged to be not proven. Upon these reasons the House would have an opportunity of acting, and to decide whether, notwithstanding the Report of the Committee,

the Bill should be again placed upon the Orders of the Day. It seems to me, therefore, that the Report is irregular, and that the Bill should be referred back to the Committee, in order that it may be disposed of in accordance with the General Rules of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: There was a motion made in Committee that the preamble was not proved, and that was declared correct by the chairman. So the Report, as recorded in our Minutes, is not accurate.

MR. LANGEVIN: The statement made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is correct. The action of the Committee ought to have been reported here. As they have not drawn up the Report as it should have been drawn up, that may be a good reason to refer it back in order that the proper Report may be made. I do not agree with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) in the opinion that the Committee cannot take into consideration the policy of passing a Bill of this kind and throwing it out. We do that every day. The hon. gentleman was present when we had under consideration a Bill about a new charter for a railway through the counties of Huntington, Chateauguay, and another county. What was done in that case? The Committee said it was not a proper thing to have two competing lines there. We must see if the existing company conforms to its charter during the next year or so. The other day we had another charter asking for a railway from Emerson to the west. We found there were reasons why we should not pass that Bill, and after discussing the matter, if the promoter had not withdrawn the Bill we would have declared that the preamble was not proven. That is strictly within the rights and privileges of the Committee. We would not be a Committee if we could not state whether it was expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioner. I do not say that the hon. member for Halton may not be right in his way of construing the matter. He thinks we should have another company. A large majority of the Committee, however, considered that that was not expedient. They urged that we had already two companies in Canada, and that those two companies were working side by side in opposition to each other, that there was