

free passes, and we are going to establish it as a right by Act of parliament, if we are honest to our country we should cut off the mileage. It is not right to have on the statutes of this country a provision in the law that a member of parliament is to be carried free by the railways, and at the same time that he shall receive mileage for coming here to attend parliament. If we are going to pass this Bill we had better dock the mileage; if we are not going to pass the law, leave the mileage as it is.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—This clause was to stand. We had better not go into a discussion of it now.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—The whole Senate should pass on this.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—We ought to settle this ourselves. We ought not to allow the railway people to come here and assign reasons why this should be struck out or kept in. It would be humiliating to us under any circumstances. Whatever we do, let us do it on our own judgment and let the railway people have nothing to do with the matter.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I understand that is what the railway people propose to do. Subsection 4 was the only portion of this clause they wished to be heard on. It is an ungrammatical expression to which they call attention.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. There is a whole page covered with objections dealing with this railway pass question.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—I am not very particular about discussing this point, but it has caused me to reflect before to-day. Listening to the argument of the hon. gentleman opposite (Hon. Mr. McMullen), I wish to say, to be logical we should not receive free passes. I am strongly of that opinion. It is more humiliating to be under an obligation to a company than to pass legislation such as exists in many countries of Europe, making it obligatory on the railway companies to carry members of both Houses free for all time to come. We stand here in many instances as judges, and we receive bribes.

Hon. GENTLEMEN—Oh.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—I call a bribe anything that we receive as a present from persons who are seeking legislation from parliament.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Do not say that.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—I do not think the hon. gentleman is immaculate in that respect. We receive passes, which are equivalent to bribes. I have myself, on many occasions, found myself in an embarrassing position when two companies were here before us, one of which had given me a pass and the other had not, and I had to consider legislation affecting them both. It made me reflect whether I was not biased by the fact that I held a pass from one of them, and I went this far, that for two or three years I refused passes from railway companies.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Quite right.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—Because I thought in my conscience I could not give an independent vote as between a company which had not bribed me with a pass and the company which had. I found in all cases I was leaning towards the company whose pass I had in my pocket. I say, therefore, to be logical we should pass an amendment forbidding members of parliament from receiving passes from companies which come before us, or exclude us from sitting as judges as between companies, some of which have given us passes and some of which have given none. Considering what has been done in England—considering this as a matter of policy not only for us but for the country at large, and for the higher independence of both Houses, I would vote for retaining this clause and making it obligatory for all companies to provide members of both House with passes. We are not, perhaps, so much affected as the other House; we must bear in mind that members of the other House have very often to come during recess to Ottawa—they have to travel on public business and are put to great expense. They, more than senators, have a reason for being granted free transportation upon all railways. I repeat, if we strike out this clause, I would vote for an amendment prohibiting members of either House from accepting a pass from any railroad. Let us be logical and have the cour-