

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (de Lanaudière)—One hundred and fifty pounds.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Is it mentioned in the Act?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—There must be a provision somewhere.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—While we are on the question of baggage, I think there should be some provision in this Act that would enable the board to require railway companies to put up in each baggage car a set of rules directing how baggage is to be handled by the porters in and around stations. There is an immense quantity of trunks and baggage absolutely ruined by reckless handling. I am sure the railway company would not sanction such destruction if they were only witnesses to it or knew it was done. The board should have power to direct that some rule should be hung up in each baggage car pointing out the duty of baggage handlers, how they should handle baggage, and that a trunk should not be thrown out on a platform recklessly. I have seen trunks hurled clean out of the car and broken, and their contents turned out on the platform, through sheer carelessness and because the baggageman was not compelled to handle the baggage carefully. I say a trunk should not be allowed to fall on a platform further than twelve inches. The railway company's employees should carry it that distance before dropping it, but where trunks are thrown on a platform many of them are ruined and their owners are put to very great inconvenience. I do not believe the railway companies are aware of the destruction of baggage that takes place. I do not think they would encourage it, and I fancy they would be quite willing to agree to any reasonable set of rules that would prevent reckless destruction of property.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Does my hon. friend fancy that if the railway company put up a notice of that kind it would have the effect of preventing reckless handling of baggage?

The clause was adopted.

Hon. Mr. FULFORD, from the committee, reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again after recess.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is it not well that we should settle what the practice should be when a Committee of the Whole rises at recess, with the intention of resuming after recess? In the House of Commons the practice was when we were in committee and there was no arrangement to proceed with other business, the chairman of the committee rose, the Speaker took the chair and said 6 o'clock, and left the chair, and then the commoners retired. When the House reassembled at eight the Speaker took the chair and vacated it and the chairman resumed his duty in committee. That has been the practice in the Commons and we carried that out to a certain extent last night, but a different practice is followed now. We propose to go on at once, but remember it is the same sitting. We are continuing this present sitting. The chairman has reported to the Speaker that the committee rises, reports progress and asks leave to sit again. The Speaker says 'when,' and the Secretary of State answers 'as soon as we reassemble.' This is neither in accord with practice or rule.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—At eight o'clock.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—But that is a continuation of the same session, and it seems to me the practice that has prevailed in the other House ought to prevail here. I see no reason why it should not. I am not finding fault with what has been done, but I think it is well that we should have it distinctly settled. My hon. friend from Killarney has been Speaker of the House in Manitoba. I do not know what the practice was there, but I should judge from the approval he is giving by the shake of his head the practice I have described prevails in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—The hon. gentleman is quite correct.

At six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

#### After Recess.

The House resumed in Committee of the Whole, consideration of Bill (21) An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

On clause 224,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There is a change in the law there. As the law stands the engi-