

has voted for it. The money voted is not the money of the individual. It is the money of the public. Some members here have argued in this way: that because they are put to trouble and expense in attending parliament in order to give these subsidies, therefore they should have free passes. I am rather inclined to think that that is a point not considered very seriously when members seek positions in parliament. Men will give their time and attention for months and months in the constituencies in order to induce the people to elect them. They do not suppose, when they are asking the suffrages of the people, that they do it because they are going to get free passes on the railways. I fully concur in the remarks made by the hon. gentleman opposite, that if there is any logic in the argument, we should extend free passes to every taxpayer who has paid a portion of the subsidy. I do not know why we should discuss this matter any more, but I would suggest a much simpler mode of reaching it than my hon. friend has proposed. The Bill which is before us, provides that the companies may grant passes to members of the provincial legislatures and of the press. Of course, the Senate and the House of Commons are not included in that, for the reason that the company are compelled by the 5th subsection to grant passes to members of parliament. If you would add 'to their goods and effects, or members of the Senate and House of Commons and of the provincial legislature, and of the press,' that would leave the companies—

Hon. Mr. OLORAN—Just where we do not want them to be.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman's interruptions are unseemly and disarrange one's idea, but prolong the discussion. Strike out the words in the 5th section, 'members of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.' That leaves them permission to do what they please, just as the law does now. The clause reads that the company shall have the private car for the board on any train. I am not object-

ing to that portion of the clause which compels them to carry the board and their apparatus, whatever they may have, and to give them a car; but what I wish to point out is this: when it says free transportation on any of the trains, we know that in the Imperial Limited of one railway and the International of the other, they require those trains as light as possible, so as to enable them to make rapid time between large centres, and I do not think they ought to be compelled to take the car of the board on these trains. But under this clause you compel them to take it on any train the board may demand. I do not think there is any use in making the motion here, but I shall give notice of a motion and we can either test it now or when the committee rises.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It is desirable that there should be a few words said on this fifth subclause from a business point of view. At the present time every member of this honourable House has passes from all the great railway companies of Canada. Every member of both Houses travels free. This clause simply proposes that the members shall enjoy that privilege as a right. As it is now every member, when he accepts a pass from a company, must naturally feel under a certain obligation to the company. Those companies are continually coming before parliament for legislation. The interests of the companies are not always identical with the interests of the public, and it is the duty of members of parliament to legislate at any rate with as keen an eye to the interests of the public as to the interests of the companies. And I think it is most desirable that this privilege which we now have of travelling free should be enjoyed as a right, and there should be no sense of obligation on the part of members to the companies. I can readily understand the opposition of the railway companies to this proposal, as some of them are opposed to it. The companies naturally feel that they have a certain leverage on the members of both Houses when they have the right to grant or withhold passes. I do