

shippers against railways. If this gentleman was appearing in the interest of the shippers and arguing against the railways, I would not object, but if he is not appearing in that capacity, I think it is a waste of public money. The shippers have always to employ counsel to contend with the most eminent counsel the railways can procure, and to argue before the commissioners for the rights of the shippers. If this is going to develop into the government paying for counsel in the interest of the shippers as against the railways, of the people as distinguished from the corporations, then I would be in favour of it. But I am pointing out that the public does not so understand it. It seems as if the people were paying out of their own pockets to the shippers to get protection before the commission, and at the same time paying some other counsel to go there who may not be directly looking after their interest.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Why not provide counsel as part of the machinery of the commission on behalf of the public, something in the nature of a Crown Attorney to look after the public interest? As I understand the purpose of the Railway Commission, it is to protect the interests and adjust the grievances of the public as between the railways on the one hand, and individuals, municipalities and the public generally on the other. Now, why not make trained counsel part of the machinery of the Railway Commission, and pay him a substantial salary, to take up the people's end of the disputes? It would save expense to the country, because the commission would not have to lose so much time in listening to inexperienced solicitors, the cases would be better presented by trained council on behalf of the public. I think this item should not be allowed to go through until the minister has considered that question.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have never gone so far as to employ counsel for diversified individual interests. The government cannot take the position of appearing before the commission by counsel as against the railway companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why should this man appear at all?

Mr. GRAHAM. This man appeared, not for the Lord's Day Alliance or against the Lord's Day Alliance. This is our own Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman said that the same gentleman, before that, had been employed in regard to express rates. I cannot understand why, if he was not there in the interest of the people against the railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was there assisting the commission in investigating the conditions and the rates of the express com-

panies. He was not there as solicitor before the Board of Railway Commissioners, combatting the express companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. But he was appointed and paid by the government. Was he not doing that in the interest of the people?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not draw the distinction. As to the matter which the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) has mentioned, I have discussed with the chairman of the commission the advisability of having standing counsel. But we have already given protection to the people by appointing as chairman of the board an ex-judge, and his assistant is a lawyer as well. For my part, I want to keep this board from becoming a real court; I want to keep it as a body before whom I may go myself without any lawyer, and say to the chairman, This is my case, I want a judgment upon it. If we were to engage counsel to appear against the counsel of the railways, then we would simply have to sit back and listen to them as we do in any court.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CANADIAN, LIVERPOOL AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canadian, Liverpool and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

On section 2:

Mr. S. SHARPE. Mr. Chairman, as a young member I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on this Bill when it was before the Railway Committee and also to the discussions that have taken place in this House. It involves important interests and very contentious matters. The interests of the province as distinguished from the interests, powers and rights of the Dominion are certainly very important. My short experience in this House has shown me that promoters of Bills frequently insert two objects; one is an important object, it is the main object and it is properly within the purview of the province and then, they insert a minor or subsidiary object that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Dominion. The whole purpose and intent of doing that is to oust the jurisdiction of the various provinces. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), when this Bill was being discussed in the Railway Committee, stated that one reason why he wanted the charter granted by this parliament was because the rates of this company could be regulated by the Railway Commission, practically ignoring the fact that the provinces have the right to regu-