

asked that this legislation should not be granted when the company had the right to increase the rates. The authorities of the city believe that if you take away from the city the competition that exists to-day the rates will go up. The whole gist of the question is that this legislation aims at destroying the competition, with the result that rates are bound to be increased. The city does not object to the two companies making a reasonable profit. If the rates are too low, surely they can get adequate rates. In reply to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), as to the resolution passed by the city council, or the promise made by it, I understand him to say that the city of Ottawa had promised a monopoly to the Ottawa Electric Company. It is true a resolution was passed by the council of the city of Ottawa promising a monopoly to the Ottawa Electric Company. I think it is open to the members of the Ottawa city council to change their minds on this question. Immediately after the resolution was passed—and it may have been secured in some way, although I am not suggesting anything of that kind—notice of reconsideration was given, and it was pointed out by the solicitor of the company that the resolution promised something that no municipality could give, that in common law it was impossible to grant a monopoly to any one company. An illustration of the fact that it was against the common law was shortly afterwards afforded by something that happened in the adjoining municipality of Hull. The corporation of the city of Hull endeavoured to give a monopoly to the Hull Company and the Ottawa Company, which is to-day seeking a monopoly in the city of Ottawa, entered a protest; an appeal was taken to the courts, and it was found to be a violation of the common law. The result is that to-day there is competition in the city of Hull, where an endeavour was made to create a monopoly. Now the point made, as I understand it, by the hon. member for South Lanark is that the city of Ottawa had entered into a bargain, or made a promise, that they afterwards did not keep. It is true this resolution was passed by the city council, but I do not think that should govern parliament. If we consider that in our judgment it is a wrong thing to interfere with the vested rights of the city of Ottawa, then I do not believe we should pass this legislation. We should not interfere with the rights of the municipality.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are now on the preamble of the Bill, and perhaps it would be more regular if we adopted the preamble and proceeded to deal with the clauses as they arise. There are clauses in the Bill which are not objectionable, and when we reach any clause that is objectionable, then we can consider the question. I have a great deal of respect for vested rights as far as cities are concerned, and I have some re-

spect for the vested rights of corporations also. I am sorry to say that I am not a municipal ownership man, but I am in favour of corporations when they are properly regulated, and I want to have an opportunity of saying so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I happen to be a friend of municipal rights.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the Speaker took the chair.

SUPPLY—PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fielding, that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I would not rise to-night to address this House on this question, which has been so well discussed this afternoon—perhaps I shall only be repeating very many of the statements that have been already made—were it not that I felt it to be an imperative duty. There are one or two reasons why I believe it imperative that I should have something to say on this question. I will endeavour to-night, in the few remarks which I make, not to discuss the Bill. There seems to be a great temptation to enter into a discussion of the Bill. When the proper time comes to discuss the Bill, I hope to have an opportunity of making a few remarks. But I will say right here that when the proper time comes my effort will be to address this House on that question in a manner absolutely free from offence to any creed or any set of people in this House or in this country. I believe that this great question in connection with the formation of these two provinces in the Northwest is more than a provincial question; it is a national question; and I believe that whatever men, or whatever hon. members on this or the other side of the House think, that is the way in which we should endeavour to discuss it. There are one or two reasons why I wish to trespass upon the time of the House. One is that I represent a constituency of the west, which I can say—and I do not do it boastfully—has to-day more elevators and grows more wheat, although it is somewhat of a large district, than any other section of a similar size in the Dominion of Canada. One other reason why I would like to make a few remarks is that the present government were good enough to give us, before the last election, increased representation. In order that we might have that increased representation, it was necessary that the constituencies that already existed should be divided. I was particularly favoured by having the honour of contesting a portion of the constituency which has been represented by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I was given the south half. In the south half of that constituency, which

Mr. STEWART.