

of the board and for the baggage and equipment, and for the official car. Will not that be interpreted to apply to members of parliament as well as to the members of the board? I know that opinions have been expressed already by legal gentlemen that it does, because the clause says:

5. The company shall furnish free transportation upon any of its trains, for members of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada and for any of the members of the board, and for such officers and staff of the board as the board may determine, with their baggage and equipment.

Do the words 'baggage and equipment' apply exclusively to members of the board, or to both classes to whom this clause compels the companies to give free transportation? And it adds:

And shall also, when required, haul free of charge any car provided for the use of the board.

From the wording of the clause, it is contended by some that the passes and the free transportation of the baggage and equipment and the car applies to both classes to whom the passes are to be granted. Now, that is a question for the lawyers to decide. I am only repeating that the interpretation that I have intimated might be given to the clause has already been given by legal gentlemen. My hon. friends who are supporting the free transportation of members of parliament over the country not only to attend to their parliamentary duties, but throughout the whole year, and to any portion of the Dominion, can say whether that clause will bear the interpretation which I have intimated some lawyers have given to it, and if it does, surely parliament never intended that, and would not be a party to enacting such legislation. Bad enough, in my opinion, is the compelling the companies to grant passes, but to go to the extent which some legal gentlemen who have interpreted this clause say it goes, would be altogether beyond what is right and proper. It would be an imposition upon the railway companies that should not be forced upon them by any legislative body, nor should any member of either House, or any public man, ask them to do it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is very easy to make this clause read as it was intended.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I express my individual opinion, because it is asked by the hon. member.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—There is no doubt that the words 'with their baggage and equipment' refer only to the members of the board and their staff, because of the use of the word 'and' after 'of Canada' in the third line of this subsection. If instead of the word 'and' there was a comma, then it would be different. But with the use of the word 'and,' it seems to me the words 'with their baggage and equipment' refer only to the members of the board and their staff. However, if there is any doubt as to that, it would be easy to make it perfectly clear by providing first for the members of the board and their staff, with their baggage and equipment, and at the end of the clause to provide for the passes of the members of the Senate and the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is not worth while discussing the verbiage: it can be easily changed.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—I do not think it can be made plainer than it is. There can be no question that the car is only to be provided for the board. The statute says so. Tracing it backward, the baggage and equipment, I would answer that by asking the hon. gentleman what the equipment of a senator is?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I would not like to state publicly in the Senate what my opinion is.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—It is quite clear that equipment has no reference whatever to the equipment of a member of the House of Commons, because it would be something which, if you wanted to put in the phraseology, it would be very difficult to explain.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—What about the word 'baggage'?

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—Then the word 'baggage' is coupled with the word 'equipment,' and if equipment does not apply to a senator or members of the House of Commons, the word 'baggage' would