

general understanding that the company was responsible. I say that if any company exercises such control or such power, then it is injurious both to the farmer and to the man who wants to buy.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. When this Bill was before the Private Bills Committee, it was opposed on the ground that it looked too much like a combination, like allowing millers, farmers and others to combine for the purpose of getting grain at a cheaper price, to the detriment of the farmer. One of the great objections taken was to clause 7 because it restricted the membership of the association. If this association has such benevolent purposes as the promoters pretend, there is no object in restricting the membership to certain specified individuals. Why not have the shares placed on the market and allow any one who desires to purchase them? I raised that objection before the committee, but like many other private Bills coming before that committee it was rushed through with little consideration.

Progress reported.

#### LONDON AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—Mr. Harris.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill was somewhat intricate in its different provisions, as it was dealing with companies that had already made agreements with the municipalities in that part of the province. In order that the Railway Committee might thoroughly understand what all these agreements meant which we were asked to confirm, this Bill was referred to a special committee who went into it thoroughly and this amended Bill is the result of their work. I think from the report brought in by the special committee of the Railway Committee, that the rights of the municipalities are perfectly guarded with reference to the agreements they had formerly made with these other companies which this company proposes to take over.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is this the Bill concerning which certain delegates waited on the Railway Committee asking for the insertion of a clause protecting the Sabbath Observance law in relation to this railway? I understand that Dominion jurisdiction is being given over what were previously provincial railways. Is it the intention of the government to put in a clause protecting the Sabbath Observance law as requested by the delegation?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon friend was in the committee when the Bill was thoroughly discussed, and I do not think he moved any amendment to that effect. It was perfectly free to any member to move anything he chose. The matter was discussed and the committee decided that if the Railway Commission were to be brought under Dominion jurisdiction it must come under the provisions of the Railway Act of the Dominion in its entirety and be subject to the Railway Board.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Under section 8, you give them power to acquire the Southwestern Traction Company. Has that company power to sell?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, the sale was carried out under the order of the court. The Southwestern Traction Company was wound up by the court, and its assets were sold by order of the court.

On section 15,

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is that the usual form in which this clause is inserted in these Bills? It says that it must be approved by a by-law of the council. Should it not be ratified by the people, because frequently the railway companies can carry a by-law by influence in the council, that would not be approved by the people. Should they not be obliged to obtain assent of the people as expressed by their votes?

Mr. GUTHRIE. We do not usually insert such a provision.

Mr. S. SHARPE. It was done in the Michigan and Ontario Power Company Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It may be inserted in some particular instances, but it is not usual.

Mr. BEATTIE. This is a special clause drawn by the city solicitor for London who thought it was all that was necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. The object of that clause was to provide in case a municipality had a plant of its own, that this company should not become a competitor with it. If a municipality had a plant of its own the people would be sufficiently interested not to pass a by-law unless they thought proper to do so.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

#### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Forget.