

cided that no commissioner shall be interested in any railway company, and therefore the parties, in proceeding before the commission, are protected to that extent, that no commissioner can be interested in a railway company, and the railway companies who have scrutinized this Bill thoroughly have not raised any objection to this clause. If it is to be amended, it will have to be redrafted, and we would have to define the degree of kindred or affinity which would disqualify—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—First cousin, or second cousin.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—Otherwise we cannot leave it in an indefinite way—either adopt it that way or define what it shall be.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN (de Lanaudière)—I think the clause should be adopted in this way. It is always open to any party to object to a commissioner if he thinks he is interested. The hon. gentleman from de Lormier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) would make it imperative upon the Governor in Council to disqualify him in these cases. Therefore I would move that the clause be adopted as it stands.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—A great many of the acts of the commissioners may be quite perfunctory and mere formal matters and as to these it would be a matter of indifference whether there was relationship, but where it comes to a matter of substance, either party can ask that the commissioner do not sit.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 16,

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I move that the words 'together, or separately or either,' in line 18 and 19 be struck out, because as it stands it is contradictory in terms. It is stated that they may sit separately, and it is stated also that the quorum of the board shall be constituted of two members. In another clause, there are certain things which can be attended to by one commissioner, so I move that these words 'together or separately' be struck out.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They are small matters that a single commissioner may adjudicate on.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—That is specially provided for in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—This is a very wide clause, and is intended to give wide discretion.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—This clause is contradictory in terms, because it is stated in the same clause, any two members of the board shall constitute a quorum.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Clause 10 says so too.

Hon. Mr. KERR (Toronto)—That has reference to any complaint made which has to be determined in open court. That is, an open court sitting which must consist of not less than two.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—But a commissioner may be required to adjudicate on a matter to which both parties consent. By arrangement the parties may be satisfied. One commissioner may go down to a particular locality and settle a dispute. I would not like to narrow it.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 25,

Hon. Mr. POWER—Hon. gentlemen will remember that representatives of the railway companies laid a great deal of stress on the side and end ladder question. The point I wish to make now is this, that under this clause the commissioners have power to deal with that matter, paragraph (f), provides:

(f) With respect to the rolling stock, apparatus, cattle-guards, appliances, signals, methods, devices, structures and works, to be used upon the railway so as to provide means for the due protection of property, the employees of the company, and the public.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Also under paragraph (c).

Hon. Mr. POWER—Yes, probably.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 111, subsection 4,

4. The power of issuing bonds conferred upon the company hereby, or under the special Act, shall not be construed as being exhausted by such issue; but such power may be exercised from time to time, upon the bonds constituting such issue being withdrawn or paid off and duly cancelled; but the limit to the amount of securities fixed in the special Act shall not be exceeded: Provided that no power to issue or dispose of any such securities under any special Act of the provincial legislature, in connection