

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I hope that change will not be made. Railway companies do take all the advantages they can in delaying freight.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—Is it to their advantage to delay traffic?

Hon. Mr. WATSON—It is certainly to the disadvantage of their customers if they delay freight. Take last year, for instance: the difference in price between wheat in elevator in Manitoba and wheat on car was seven cents per bushel, which was a direct loss to the farmer. The company say: 'We have so much rolling stock, and we will not provide any more, because with it we can carry out this crop by the time the next crop comes in,' and the grain remains in the country at a loss of millions of dollars to the farmers in the North-west. Railway companies are supposed, and have been supposed in the past, to take care of the freight and forward it without delay, and we hope that the commissioners under this Act will see that the railway companies furnish sufficient accommodation to take care of the traffic of the country. That is what we expect from the operation of this Act, and we do not want to put anything in the Act that will give the railway company any excuse under this Act. If we are going to fix up this Bill to suit the railway companies, and leave it to the discretion of the board, then the board will not be of much use to the public.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The board has not control over that. It is a matter for the courts.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Then the court should compel the railway companies to furnish rolling stock for the traffic. They are common carriers, and have had large subsidies, and I think the board should have wide powers to compel these railway companies to furnish sufficient accommodation on their roads.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—I am not one of those interested in any railway corporation, but I am largely interested as one having a great deal for railways to carry, and I must say that, in my opinion, the railways are being very considerably hampered by this kind of legislation. What were the condi-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

tions last year? The conditions last year in the east were that shippers had to wait for some three or four months for cars—I myself, in fact, asked for cars in August and they were not supplied until March this year. Now, I would have exactly the same complaint to make, but what were the conditions? The conditions were that all the cars were absorbed in the carrying of freight from the west. Gentlemen who wish to impose on railways such onerous conditions are very unfair. What is the condition so far as the west is concerned? Simply this: An abnormal crop is raised there, and they desire to impose a condition by which railways are compelled to carry that crop out of the country in two or three months' time. In the best interests of the people in the North-west themselves the sooner they make provision whereby they can store their crop for a certain period of time, not forcing the carrying of it out of the country speedily, the better for the North-west. They force their grain upon the market in a very short space of time, and depress the market. It is much more in their interests to do exactly as we do in this portion of the country, store their grain for a time, and sell it as the market requires. But these gentlemen in the west force it on the market; not only do they disturb the whole traffic of the country, but they disturb everything in the carrying trade for the benefit of one section of the country. These conditions are not fair. Railway companies are in just the same position as manufacturers, or the farmers themselves. They cannot undertake to do an abnormal and impossible thing. They can only do what is possible, and the conditions desired by a number of our North-west friends—and they have my sympathy and best wishes—are impracticable and should not be insisted upon. Railway corporation should have fair-play, and conditions should not be imposed on them which are impracticable.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUÉ—This is a very important clause both to the railway companies and the people at large, and it should be dealt with only after very serious consideration. To my mind, introducing into this clause the word 'unduly,' or 'unreasonable,' or 'unnecessary' would be to defeat the object of the clause. It should stand as it is, but a proviso should be added, giving power