

by the hon. Secretary of State with the amendment of the hon. gentleman from de Salaberry. At least, it would be possible for us to declare, or enact, that the Railway Commission shall not have control of the through traffic when a provincial railway crosses the federal railway, but that a notice shall be given to the provincial government in order that the Railway Commission shall be allowed to decide as to through traffic, because the provincial government, or the company organized under a provincial statute, may be in a position to prove that the rates which may be established by the Railway Commission should have been in a certain way, that they may make a report which would have an effect on the Railway Commission. The least we could do would be to give to the provincial government, or the company chartered by the provincial government, a chance to be represented before the commission. So, if the question were postponed, I think that we might come to a conclusion which would reconcile the statement of the hon. Secretary of State with the opinions of the hon. gentleman from de Salaberry, and perhaps introduce an amendment regarding through traffic and giving certain control to the provincial governments and local companies. I would add the words that notice shall be given the provincial government and the provincial company.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The Railway Commission will not undertake to fix rates for through traffic over a provincial line without letting the owners of the road know.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—There is nothing to oblige them.

Hon. Mr. POWER—They will, as a matter of course.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I shall press the amendment.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman deals only with clause 6 of the Bill and it leaves clauses 5 and 7, which are open to the same objection as clause 6, in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—No, it strikes them out.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles, does not touch clauses 5 and 7. The amend-

Hon. Mr. DAVID.

ment of the hon. gentleman from de Salaberry strikes out the whole three clauses, and substitutes a new clause for 6. The amendment of the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles, is not an amendment which he can adopt just now. If the amendment of the hon. gentleman from de Salaberry is rejected, we might be in a position to deal with the other amendment.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—It is but proper that I should answer the argument made by the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles. I know that he is altogether provincial, and I am in considerable accord with him in that respect, and I think that he is satisfied of that; but let us be practical, and not go to an extent which will not be permanent, let us take a stand which will be lasting. I am afraid that if we encumber this legislation with too many amendments we shall defeat what I took to be a very good object, that of preserving in a proper measure the rights of the provinces. We have had the experience of the past. We have gone a very long way towards destroying the rights of the provinces, and now let us take a broad position which will enable us to maintain it. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles to this fact: as was very well stated by the Speaker, it is not likely that the commission would deal with a local railway without negotiating with the province, if the road was owned by the province, and even if it did, it would be open to the province the next day to make representations if they were not satisfied with the rates, and it would be open to the board to agree with these representations and modify the regulations, if it was deemed advisable; but if we provide for exceptional machinery in case the road belongs to the province, I fail to see that it would be conducive to a good object.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—Not being a lawyer, I do not tatch on to all the intricacies of this question, but I intend to vote against the amendment. The hon. gentleman who introduced the amendment quoted from two prominent members of the House of Commons, the Postmaster General and the leader of the Opposition. It appears to me that these two gentlemen, having laid down a principle in support of which he quoted, and this measure having come to this House after those