bers, one a lawyer, one a business man, and one a railway man. Only the first of these good intentions was fulfilled. Now would appear to be a suitable opportunity to give the Commission, more fully, the confidence of the people. We would prefer to see three lawyers in this Court of six members, for, whether it be the home section or a travelling section of the Court, there should be a competent legal member always present to decide questions of law.

As to what sections of the community the other two new commissioners should represent, very many suggestions have been made, e.g., railway men, business men, manufacturers, shippers, telegraphers, farmers, mechanics and railway employees, but it seems most important that a man with railway experience should be a member of the Board. There is nothing in the argument frequently advanced that such a man would be influenced in favour of railway companies; while, on the other hand, his technical knowledge of the workings of railways would be of inestimable value is assisting the Board to arrive at a proper conclusion. One familiar with transportation would be a useful member. We hope to find that all the new members are practical men, and we fail to see why any section of the community should be represented other than lawyers, railway men and business men. These three seem to combine all the necessary requirements of a competent Board.

The death of the Chief of the Railway Commission, in addition to delaying and crippling the general work of that body, may be realized in a definite way in connection with the Bell Telephone investigation, in which the late Chief had heard an enormous amount of evidence and was preparing his judgment. It is possible that the evidence may have to be reheard, although by consent of the parties this will be unnecessary. At the time of Mr. Blair's resignation the Fort William telephone case, and others, were in a similar position, and it was