

mon carriers of this country, and I should like to know why they should not be treated like any other white men and be responsible for delay. A common carrier would be responsible for delay in delivering goods, and if he would be responsible, why should not a railway company be held responsible also? That is all apart from the question of whether the goods are to be brought from the west to the east or the east to the west. It is a proposition which is a good one, I think, everywhere, and which seems to me to solve the whole problem. Treat these common carriers who have the monopoly the same as those who have not.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—I am not speaking for railway companies; I am on the other side, but I want to deal fairly with railway companies; the railway companies have one single advantage, and that alone, and that is the right of expropriation. Beyond that they have nothing. I want to answer my hon. friend on the lumber question. I desire to tell him that in this part of the country there is not to-day, and there never has been, and I do not think there ever will be, a combination among lumbermen in so far as affecting the price of lumber.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I am speaking of the west. I do not know anything about the east.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS—I have no doubt in the west a great many wrong things prevail, and good as they are and great things as they are doing for Canada, they wish to impose upon many parts of the country other things that are wrong.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUÉ—When I made a few remarks a short time ago, I had not read paragraph 4 of this clause, and I find it is amply sufficient. It answers the very purpose which I had in view. It seems to me the clause should stand as it is. Under subsection 4 the board has all the necessary power to provide for abnormal conditions, and unless there are abnormal conditions the company should be compelled to comply.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I just wish to say that I have no apology to make for the time I occupied, and with respect to the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Marshfield, that the leaders on both sides should consult. I took the opportunity, a

few moments after the hon. gentleman from Marshfield had subsided, to occupy the time of this House, and I should say, so far as the hon. gentleman from Rockland is concerned, that his last reference to the west is very unfair. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman where any member from the west has suggested anything unfair or unreasonable. These clauses have been carefully considered in the House, and carefully discussed by the minister who introduced them, and I consider that it was from the experience the ex-Minister of Railways has had, and the experience of the members of the House of Commons have had with these carriers in the west, that they prepared that clause, believing they were giving a power to this commission that the west has been demanding for years with the expectation that they would give some relief on the matter of transportation.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman ought to know, whether he does or not, that the Minister of Railways was overruled in very many of these provisions, that he is not at all in accord with many of these clauses that the hon. gentleman is now advocating with so much vigour and vim.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The minister was in favour of this clause.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman instanced the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and his experience to justify our accepting this law as it is now before us. My reply to that is that the Minister of Railways was not in accord with many of these clauses as shown by the discussion in the House, and if he were that is no reason why we should accept it. As to my hon. friend from Toronto, if what he contends is correct, that the railway companies are common carriers and the common carriers are punishable for any neglect of duty, then there is no necessity for this provision, because as common carriers they are subject to the law which governs common carriers and would have to abide by the penalty.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—The amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman from Calgary should meet the views of the House. I do not think we can get anything better