

sels in inland waters to be British subjects. It was discussed during several sessions and was sent to a special committee last session which reported. I am introducing the Bill in exactly the same language as that which was reported last session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENTS.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill requires protection to the people upon level crossings in cities, towns and villages. It was sent to the Senate twice and was rejected by the Senate last year. I shall ask the House to send the Bill back to that body for reconsideration. It was passed unanimously by this House, and the Bill I am now introducing is exactly the same as that which this House passed last session with the exception that it will come into operation a year later.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act. He said: I wish to amend that clause of the Act which deals with the beginning and the completion of a railway. I wish to make that clause operative and have the effect the House intended it should have. At present there is a clause in each railway charter compelling the company to begin construction within two years and complete within five years. That clause enables the railway company to evade this obligation. What happens in many cases is this. Railway companies get charters here by the dozen covering hundreds and thousands of miles of territory. They are supposed to begin construction within two years and in some cases they do. But if a company is not ready to go on with its construction before the end of the second year, all it has to do is to grade a mile or two of track, and then it is not obliged to do anything more for the next three years, so that at the end of five years nothing whatever is done worth mentioning. Then at the end of five years the company comes back and gets a renewal of its charter. Thus we find many railway charters issued and nothing done. If that were the only bad effect, it perhaps would not be so serious, but another bad effect is that other railway companies are prevented from getting charters and constructing a railway over the ground covered by the first charter. Suppose a second company should get a charter covering the same route and should attempt to build its railway, the original charter holders would go right on with their road. In my part of the country there are two or three

Mr. LANCASTER.

charters which have been in existence a number of years, and practically nothing has been done towards building the railways, and no other railway company can come in and build the road. The company holding the charter claim they cannot get the men or the material to build the branch line. But I notice that these companies seem to get plenty of men and material to build branch lines in those parts of the country where they hope to cut out the lines of other companies. What I propose in this amendment is this: Within two years of the granting of the charter, at least ten per cent of the mileage of the railway under charter shall be completed and put in operation; and during the third year ten per cent additional and during the fourth year another ten per cent additional shall be completed, the whole to be finished, as now provided, within five years. I do not say that these are exactly the right percentages. In a short railway it would be too small, and in a long railway it might, perhaps, be a rather heavy demand for the first two years. But I would be quite willing to change the figures if good reason is shown for so doing. This matter has been discussed to a certain extent in the Railway Committee. It is a matter of very serious import. I trust the House will pass this Bill so that we may be able to compel the railways either to build the roads they are chartered to build, or drop their charters. That is the main object—if a company will not build the road let them drop their charter inside of five years and give some other railway company the opportunity to come in and do the business.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDUSTRIAL AND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) respecting Co-operation. He said: This Bill was presented last session, discussed in the House and referred to a special committee. That committee held many sittings and went fully into the merits of this legislation, examining employees from the Department of Agriculture and outside witnesses also. The result of the committee's consideration was that the Bill was fully endorsed and commended as one calculated to help the development of agriculture and fruit culture, and as a very useful credit and loan measure. The report of the committee is very extensive, covering over two hundred printed pages. It goes very fully into the merits of the measure. There is an appendix in which are given the laws of other countries that have adopted legislation on co-operation. In this report, which was unanimous and favourable to the measure, the committee recommended that the Bill be taken charge