

Mr. TURRIFF. It is as follows:

1. In addition to the provisions of the Railway Act with respect to tolls, to be taken or levied by the said companies it is hereby enacted that there shall be no secret special rates, rebates, drawbacks or concessions to favoured shippers nor any act or thing that will affect or prevent free competition in any line or lines of trade.

2. Each of the said companies shall be obliged, upon the request of any township or county, municipality through which the line of railway passes, to carry road making material, gravel or stone, required for improving any of the road within any such municipality, at the cost of handling and carriage.

Section 22 provides that in the event of the Dominion government taking over the road, the subsidy given by the Ontario government shall be returned to them by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. These two clauses are being confirmed in the Bill which I am now asking to be read the second time.

Mr. CONMEE. I have sent copies of this Bill to the city of Port Arthur, which is interested in it, because the subsidy granted by the Ontario government was granted upon condition that the road should come to the shores of Thunder bay. I do not say that this Bill would relieve the company of that obligation, but it might do so. In my opinion the road as constructed is six or seven miles from Thunder bay.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) oppose the Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. No, I am only asking that it stand until I have an opportunity of hearing from the representatives of the city of Port Arthur. I had an interview this morning with one of the gentlemen connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and I understood from him that the Bill was to stand until the solicitor of the company came here to discuss the Bill and I desire to hear from Port Arthur. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill seems to be a peculiar Bill. If I understand it correctly, it is to carry out an arrangement made between the Ontario government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. To begin with, I can hardly accept the policy that any other government and any company can get together and make an agreement which will commit us to pass any Act. It may be all right or it may not be all right. There may be some things in the Bill which it would be perfectly proper for us to confirm in order to protect the Ontario government against any acts that might be done by the company in default; but there is another part referring to rates which to my mind is not in accordance with our Railway Act. While one portion of the Bill insists that the Grand Trunk

Pacific Railway Company must not give any special rates or rebates to any person, another portion says that it must give special rates and rebates. To my mind these provisions are contradictory, and we are asked to confirm them both. The Board of Railway Commissioners having been adopted by us as the means whereby we control rates, for my part I want to adhere to that policy, and I would not wish to assent to any Act that would take the control of the rates to be charged by a company chartered by this parliament away from the Railway Commission. There may be some things in the Bill that it is necessary for us to confirm, but there are two or three things in it which at present I do not think we ought to confirm.

Motion for adjournment of debate agreed to.

ONTARIO AND MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Power Company.

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give some explanation of this Bill, as I believe it is practically the same as the Bill that was introduced last year.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not think it necessary to take up the time of the House in discussing the Bill before it went to the committee. I think hon. gentlemen understand the Bill fairly well. It is practically the same Bill as was introduced into the Senate last year, and practically the same as was carried in the Senate two years ago, with this difference, that in the previous Bill provision was made for the storage of water on the rivers mentioned, and in the first Bill reference was made to the Sturgeon river. All reference to that river and to storage of water upon either of the streams or the tributary waters has been removed from this Bill. The hope of the promoters was to simplify the Bill in order to remove criticism. It does not differ at all from a large number of Bills that have passed this House in recent years. I may say that the Ontario legislature has passed Bills similar in character to this, but with less safeguards. If it were necessary for me at this stage to discuss the Bill specifically, I think I could satisfy hon. gentlemen that no Bill that has come before the House within recent years has had better or more specific safeguards to protect the public interest. I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to go to the committee, where it can be discussed in all its details.

Mr. BOYCE. This is the third session during which we have had discussion on the