

which to bring before the powers that be their complaints, and naturally so, and every representative of the people thinks it his duty to his constituents to urge the claims made to him. Now the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) stated correctly that there are claims made to the Department of Railways and Canals that it has no power to settle, even if the minister and every member of the government wanted to settle them. The question is: Are we liable under the Act governing the running of the government railway? And if we are not, and it is referred to the Justice Department, as it must be, then the Justice Department must, under the Act, say that we have no right to pay; and if all these conditions were waived, the Auditor General would not let us pay. The members of this House, if they understood this thoroughly, would not have so many grievances against the Department of Railways and Canals as to the non-settlement of claims, which in many cases the department has no possible power to settle, no matter how willing it might be. During the present session an amendment has been made to the law by which the government railway is brought so far as possible under the provisions of the ordinary Railway Act as to the settlement of claims. Perhaps this will reduce the difficulty to a certain extent, but I imagine these claims will still have to go before the Exchequer Court as they do to-day, although the causes of complaint will be easier to be got at in a way. When cattle are killed on the track, for instance, the owners of them will find a settlement easier on account of the fact that the law is so changed that the conditions under which cattle may not go on the track are not the same as they were previously. I agree without hesitation that that is a weakness. I do not mean a weakness in the manning of the branch at all, but in existing conditions under the law, and under the Act governing government owned railways, it has been impossible to do even what the minister might want to do in the way of settling claims. I am in hopes that the new condition of affairs will remove some of the difficulties, because I want to say to the members of the House that so far as the department is concerned it has no desire whatever to shirk responsibility in paying claims that ought to be paid, even if, under the Act as it has been constituted, there might be no legal liability. There are cases that have come under my attention when I would gladly have made a settlement, cases of bodily injury where death has ensued, but there has been no legal liability; and the House need not be startled if I ask them before this session closes to vote money to pay some of these claims for which there is no legal liability, but which I think as matter of equity and of humanity ought to receive recognition at the hands of

Mr. GRAHAM.

this parliament. Now, taking up the resolution and the statement:

That in the opinion of this House the names 'Intercolonial Railway' and 'Prince Edward Island Railway' should be dropped, and the name 'Interprovincial Railway' substituted therefor.

Without going into the question of the cost of transferring the rolling stock from Intercolonial to Interprovincial, let me say this, that there may not seem to be much in names, but if you take any business in the Dominion of Canada or elsewhere, the name of the company or the name of the firm is considered one of the most valuable assets in that business. It is a trade mark, it is the name which stands for certain things; and long years after the men who first formed the company or the partnership are gone, their names are still retained in the business in order that the standing the business had may be kept up under the original name. It is so with the Intercolonial. This is a government-owned railway, the world knows the Canadian government railway under the name of the Intercolonial. Wherever you go and discuss with railway men, they know that Canada owns a railway, they know the name of it, it stands for something. Leaving out the consideration of the cost, I would hesitate very much before I would consent to allow the name of the Intercolonial to be removed from the rolling stock of the government railway and be replaced by any other name, modern or otherwise. I believe we had better retain the name Intercolonial for what it stands for and what it has stood for. I may say in passing that I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the Intercolonial at present stands for a good roadbed, and a good service at minimum cost. We do not want to change the name, we do not want to change these conditions, but to make them better if possible. Take the next section:

That the government system of railways should be considered as one entity in the keeping of accounts and in all other respects.

On the face of it that looks very easy, but under present conditions the Department of Railways and Canals requires every railway in the Dominion of Canada to make a return along certain conditions. You have to give the number of cars, what they cost, the mileage, what it cost to build, you have to go along certain lines in making out the original cost, the expenses, and all that kind of thing. It would be impossible for a narrow gauge road and a standard gauge road to unite in this return to parliament. So long as the road on Prince Edward Island is maintained as a narrow gauge road, so long the railway itself must be considered as an entity by itself, and it cannot be reported upon in connection with a standard gauge railway. Then there is another thing I will point