

not think that is a right condition of things. There are gentlemen who talk in a very patriotic way who, I suppose, have not paid railway fares in Canada for themselves for the last quarter of a century. I do not think hon. members who are in that position are at the same time in a position to preach sermons against those who are willing to adopt this clause. If we are not to have this clause, then the better way would be to put an end to the granting of passes altogether. Either position is right and proper. Either have no free travelling on railways, or have it free by law. That is a position which should commend itself to the common sense of every hon. gentleman here, and I am satisfied it would commend itself to the common sense of the people through the country. The people do not wish that their representatives should be under obligations to the companies. If the representatives are to travel free, the people think it better they should travel free as a right and not by way of compliment.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman has no right to attribute to those who differ from him dishonest motives in the course they pursue.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I did not attribute any motives.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—But are we to understand, because members of this House have received passes in the past, that therefore the legislation in this House has always been in the interests of the railways? I think I can appeal to the records of the House to show that those gentlemen who received passes, whether for twenty-five years or less time, have exercised the powers vested in them as members of the Senate to do that which the hon. gentleman thinks they cannot do or have not done.

Hon. Mr. POWER—No, excuse me.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes, that is the insinuation. There is no use mincing the matter. The insinuation is that because senators have received passes in the past, they have not done their duty to the country.

Hon. Mr. POWER—No, nothing of the kind.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes, that is the only inference which can be drawn from the remarks which he has made.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Nothing of the sort.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I appeal to the records of the House and to hon. members present as to whether statements of that kind, either by inference or in any other way, are justified. This House has set at defiance the actions of the other House upon very important points when they have come before them, though they may have had passes in their pockets. I do not believe it is a good policy, nor do I believe it is consistent with the dignity of the parliament, to compel railways to grant passes. That is my view of it. I object to the hon. Speaker reading me a lecture as to my honesty or playing to the gallery because I differ from him upon a question of this kind. I think it is degrading to parliament to say that companies shall grant them passes or anything else.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—I spoke the last time this subject was before the Senate, not with the intention of evoking any feeling, and I would regret very much that any feeling should be evoked on this occasion, but my main object in rising now is to ask the hon. gentleman from Montreal, who I am glad to see is present, to retract the words which he used. If I choose to take a certain line of action on this measure and on this clause, and justify it, I have a perfect right to do so, and I have no right to have my conduct characterized as infamous and to have it said that it is disgraceful. That is what the hon. gentleman did on that occasion, and I say that he is bound, by all the courtesy of a gentleman, by all the laws of honour, apart from any rules of the Senate, to retract these words or justify them. I come here and give expression to my views, and no man in this Senate has any higher opinion of his duty than I have. No devotee going to his shrine cherishes or thinks more of the high honour of this Chamber than I do, and on every occasion, inside and outside of it, I have endeavoured to so shape my conduct