

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the scope of the clause. The amendment is in the direction of a demand made by the railway companies themselves, who do not want to be precluded from giving reduced rates to associations. This is in the line of the demand made by the railway companies.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I would suggest that subclause 3 of 275 should stand. An amendment should be prepared practically striking this clause out and permitting the company to issue free transportation to whomsoever they please. It seems to me to be an extraordinary restriction that is forced upon railway companies to say that they are not at liberty to issue free transportation to persons to travel over their line of railway or steamships, it is certainly unique and I do not think it should be forced upon the company.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—The railways are often very liberal to associations which are a benefit to them, such as bridge companies, for instance, and a liberal policy on the part of railways in those cases has been a great advantage to the public at large. This is a permissive clause, and the wider we can make it the better. It takes the sting out of the rest of the Bill, and I think probably the substitution of something giving them general power to carry free whom they please would be better.

Hon. Mr. POWER—This clause with the amendment is about as wide as it should be.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—A railway company cannot always go before the board when they wish to issue free transportation to a person in a distant point. I might instance the case of many delegations going from the eastern portions of Canada to the North-west. Delegates from all quarters are going there nearly every day, and we find a preclusion embodied in this section by which the railway company, without going before the board, cannot issue free transportation to those people. No provision is made for that class of transportation. It would be utterly impossible to include in this clause every class of transportation that might arise. Surely it should be left to the discretion of the company to say to whom they shall issue transporta-

tion. It seems to me it is not in the public interest that it should be so entirely divorced from the discretion of the company.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—In drafting the clause I consulted the railway solicitors. It has always been recognized that the board is to have control of freight rates. There is no discrimination, and it is quite easily understood that railway companies might discriminate in the matter of getting freight over their road by giving passes, and if the board is to prevent discrimination in freights, you must give them some control over it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think it would be far better to leave it to the discretion of the company itself. I therefore move that the company be substituted for the board.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It nullifies clause 265 altogether.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I draw the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that it will nullify more than one section of the Bill. The word 'traffic' is defined in the interpretation part of the Bill, and then not only in 265, but in other sections; the economy of the Bill is to have a uniformity of rate in reference to passenger as well as freight, and unless you revise all those clauses you cannot wipe out this clause. I approve of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Calgary to this extent: it is not easy to provide for all cases, but it seems to me the proviso in subclause 3 covers the point giving to the board a right by regulation from time to time to extend or limit the classes of persons to whom the railway company may be allowed to issue free passes, or commutation tickets, or anything of that kind, and it seems to me it is covered by these words:

Provided the carriage of the traffic by the company under this subsection may in any particular case, or by the general regulation, be restricted, limited or qualified by the board.

Now the carriage of traffic at first sight might be deemed to exclude passengers, but if we turn to the interpretation clause we will find that traffic is stated to include passengers, goods and rolling stock: therefore it is equivalent to this: provided the carriage of passengers by the company under this subsection may be regulated, etc.