

railway companies have been generous to members of parliament, and they did not take any exception to it being provided in the Act, that these passes should be given. If there is any suspicion in the country that members of parliament are influenced—and we know there is such a suspicion—we see views expressed in the press of the country that members are influenced by receiving passes—if we provide by law that members are entitled to free transportation, we remove any idea on the part of the electorate that members are influenced by receiving passes from railway corporations. Inasmuch as this is in the Bill, and has not been objected to by the railway companies, we should retain it, and have members of both Houses receive, as a matter of right, free transportation, which they do as a matter of fact receive by grace from the companies now. I expressed myself in the same way before, and I retain my opinion. In the past we know transportation has been withheld because certain members did not support certain legislation. I know that as a fact, because I was for some years deprived of free transportation, while nearly every member of the House of Commons received a pass, simply because I did not support certain legislation. It is unfair that any member should be placed in that position; and inasmuch as the railway companies do not object to the clause, and now grant free transportation to members of parliament, I say it should be made a matter of right, rather than of grace on the part of the companies.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—If the hon. gentleman's argument amounts to anything, we should prevent them giving passes to anybody. If there is a member of parliament who would be influenced by the receipt of a pass, and it were known, the best thing to do would be to expel him, or prevent the issuing of passes altogether. I do not think the hon. gentleman has given the correct reason, in fact, I know he has not, for the position taken by the representatives of the railways, in the meeting held the

other day. The reason given to me personally why they did not discuss it, was because it was a delicate matter affecting each member of the Senate and they thought it was better to leave it to themselves to deal with it, than to discuss it at the meeting. The railways are decidedly opposed, not to granting passes particularly, but to being compelled to grant passes; or to make it part of the law of the country that they shall grant passes. That is what they object to. I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion that they do not object to it.

Hon. Mr. WATSON.—Mr. Wainwright told me himself personally that he did not object to this clause. As a matter of fact, he said they gave passes, and they would as soon give them by law as not.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—I do not know what Mr. Wainwright told the hon. gentleman; I know in my conversation with the railway people the view they expressed to me was quite to the contrary, and I have no less than three or four pages furnished by the representatives of the railway people, protesting against the clause as an infringement of their rights. They go so far as to say you might just as well compel them to give a member his breakfast in the morning. I do not understand the position taken by the hon. gentleman, but I am speaking of what I know myself personally.

Hon. Mr. WATSON.—So am I.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—More than that, I am opposed to the principle completely, of compelling any corporation to give free transportation to any one. It is mentioned by many hon. gentlemen who are advocating this, that because the railways get subsidies they should grant to members of the two Houses of parliament free transportation. They get the subsidy from the representatives of the people. It is a free gift by the people through their representatives, and if the people do not approve of it, they can easily reject the member who