

should try to provide for cases of that kind, before we deal with the Bill finally.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is not that provided for by subsection (c) of clause 275 ?

Hon. Mr. WATSON—One word might be added to the clause to cover the ground. In the ninth line of that subsection insert the word 'extended.' They might get permission from the board. Take, for instance, the congress of the Chambers of Commerce held in Montreal the other day ; if the company wished to extend the courtesy of the road to them, they could not do so under the wording of this clause.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—The suggested amendment would only apply to the class of reduced tickets or passes already described in the clause. This is a different class of cases, and I think it is desirable something should be done to make some such provision as has been suggested.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The object is, that the board in their discretion might extend the right to railroad companies to give passes.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—That would only extend what is already described ; but this is a new clause.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I would not make it a clause at all. Give the board permission, as I have suggested.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I had no time to draw that clause clearly. I merely direct the attention of the House to the subject in order that they may be better prepared to deal with it when we meet again.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (de Lanaudière)—It is a pity to let the clause stand for just adding one word. Give them power to apply to the board. Supposing they wished to take immigration agents from the old country over their line, they could apply to the board and get permission to give these people free transportation.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Under what principle are we legislating to prevent railway companies from issuing passes to whomsoever they wish ? Hon. gentlemen must consider the fact that this Bill actually precludes a railway company from issuing a pass except to particular classes enumerated in clause 275. The question is whether

it is good policy to make such a provision. It cannot be said in the issuance of a pass that it is a discrimination ; yet it seems to me the Act is so framed that it operates in that way.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (de Lanaudière)—It is a great relief to railway companies to be able to point to the law when they are asked to issue passes, and say, 'we are sorry, but the law forbids us.'

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—It might also hamper them in a very great degree. Many railway companies have large tracts of land for settlement and their desire and object is to get them settled. I know it is the custom in the North-west for the Canadian Pacific Railway to give passes to large parties from the United States and from the older provinces of Canada in order to induce people to visit the North-west to examine the lands and report to others. Now, I do not think there is anything in the clause which would cover that, and merely introducing the word 'extended,' as suggested by the hon. member, would not create a new class as desired.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—The word 'qualified' would cover it.

Hon. Mr. FULFORD, from the committee, reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again.

MARITIME RAILWAY AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY'S BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. Mr. FROST moved the second reading of Bill (180) An Act to incorporate the Maritime Railway and Transportation Company.

Hon. Mr. YEO—Before this Bill is read a second time, I think the hon. gentleman in charge of it should give some information in regard to it. It seems to me the Bill calls for large powers, particularly with reference to steamship transportation. Of course, if the hon. gentleman intends that the steamship company should ply between Cape Breton and New Brunswick and Great Britain or any other part of the world, that might be all right, but if it is intended to ply between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, we should certainly have some explanation. Hon. gentlemen of this House who have been here for some time will