

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (de Lanaudière)—I had the honour of moving this afternoon, that the words 'extended or restricted' be added to the clause. That covers the whole thing, and meets every case within the discretion of the board.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie will probably accept that.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I might say my object is to make it as wide as possible, so long as you do not interfere with the rights of the board to control the things specified in the Act.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If it is open for consideration, I would move an amendment to the clause as adopted. I ask for a reconsideration of subsection 3 and I move that the word 'board' be stricken out and the word 'company' inserted.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It seems to me it would be quite impracticable in a wide country like Canada, when the management decide upon granting passes to an excursion party, to obtain permission of the board. It often has to be settled in half an hour, and if they have to find out where the board are and get their permission, it embarrasses matters very much. I think the company can be trusted.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—That kills the whole Bill.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—Let us understand the effect of it.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It would leave it in the discretion of the companies.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—We must proceed knowingly, and I repeat that if this principle is to be adopted, we should reconsider several clauses of the Bill which are in direct contradiction of this: therefore we must try to make sure that we frame a Bill which has some sense on the face of it, and the Bill would have no sense whatever, as far as several clauses are concerned. If it is the sense of the House to agree with the suggestion made, the suggestion should go to this extent, that the clause should stand for the purpose of revising the other clauses and make them conform with this one.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I was going to say to the hon. gentleman from de Salaberry that if this amendment were carried, and it was contradictory to clause 265 which seems to be the troublesome clause, an amendment might be moved to that clause, or the other one to which he refers, so as to bring the three clauses into harmony.

Hon. Mr. BAKER—I suggest that sub-clause 3 stand until time be given to deliberate and frame an amendment, if an amendment should be found necessary to meet the case. For my own part, I confess that the more I hear it argued the more I am convinced that it will be wisdom to leave it as printed.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Let it stand as a notice of motion.

Hon. Mr. BAKER—It seems to me it is a mischievous amendment in the company's interest. It is incongruous that this committee should seek to restrict the power of the company in reference to its own rights in the management of its business. I think a night's consideration will convince those who have been most eager to submit amendments that it would be wise to let the company manage, to a certain extent, its own affairs.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—That is the effect of clause 3. It is a permissive clause, enlarging the powers of the company.

Hon. Mr. BAKER—It is not permissive when it strikes out a large class of passengers that the company was allowed to carry.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The hon. gentleman misapprehends the amendment. Sub-clause 3 of clause 275 is peculiarly restrictive and intended to abridge the powers of the company, and the proposal is to enlarge those powers so that the company may exercise its own jurisdiction in reference to transportation.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman from Bedford (Mr. Baker) must bear in mind that the whole object of the Bill is to restrict the operations of the company.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER—You must be careful not to do too much by legislation. You