

THIRD READING.

Bill (152) An Act to incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—
(Hon. Mr. Templeman.)

RAILWAYS LAW CONSOLIDATION
BILL.

AGAIN IN COMMITTEE.

The House resumed in Committee of the Whole consideration of Bill (21) An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

On clause 275, subsection 5,

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—When this subsection comes up I wish to move an amendment in the following words :

Provided, however, that the company shall not be liable for any injury that the person so travelling may sustain while travelling on said railway.

That is the provision we have in the passes that are issued to us at present, and if we are going to force the railways to carry members of parliament all over this country free, they ought to be protected then as they are now when they grant us passes.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman should add to the notice that the companies should pay members \$10 a day to cover expenses travelling.

The clause was allowed to stand.

On clause 276,

276. When the company owns, charters, uses, maintains or works, or is a party to any arrangement for using, maintaining or working vessels for carrying traffic, by sea or by water between any places or ports in Canada, the provisions of this Act in respect of tolls shall, so far as they are applicable, extend to such vessels and to the traffic carried thereby.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It was requested that this clause should be allowed to stand, but I think the point taken is a trifling one and possibly we might consider whether we could accept the amendment. It will be noted that it has reference to transport from points within Canada, but part of the transport by sea. It is very well known that there are vessels that sail from Montreal for points on the other side of the Atlantic and call at Quebec and other points en route, and therefore it might read better if the last line referred to the traffic only and not to the vessels. It does not seem to me it is really worth considering further. I do not think there should be any objection to the amendment.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The same care should be exercised where steamship lines on Lake Superior, for instance, connect with railways at both ends. There should be the same protection afforded passengers on vessels as on trains. With respect to tolls, there is no reason why the same rule should not apply to the tolls for freight on board those vessels as to the freight on trains; and the clause says 'only so far as they are applicable.' I do not see how that is going to do any harm, and, further, I have this feeling: that measure has come up from the House of Commons where it was considered carefully, and where the interests of the public were probably considered rather more than the interests of railway companies; and while it is our duty to see fair-play, we can trust the railway companies, as a rule, to take fairly good care of their own interests while it is the duty of the parliament to look after the interests of the public.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The objection that has been raised is not the one referred to by my hon. friend, but it is that the tolls should extend to the vessels. The object is that the tolls should extend to the traffic on vessels just in the same way as the tolls extend to the freight carried by the cars. The tolls do not extend to the cars, and they should not extend to the vessels. The tolls should be made applicable simply to the traffic.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It did seem to me the other was the common-sense reading of it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is refreshing to hear the hon. Speaker pay so much deference and respect to the Bill as it came from the House of Commons, particularly when we look at the Order paper and find that he himself has given notice to amend one or two clauses. Persons who take a different view from him on this particular question might, I think, with all due deference to other members, have an opportunity to express their views. The objection taken to this clause has not been fully pointed out. The objection is, will it not be interpreted to affect the tolls and freight upon vessels leaving a Canadian port, say Montreal or Quebec for Europe.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—No, it is between any places in Canada.