

been secured all through. My recollection is that it was said that \$250,000 had been spent—an hon. member near me says \$280,000. I do not see that any harm will be done to any body by this extension, while we may do harm by any action of ours that will cause the charter to lapse. The country wants the road built. I believe we should take the risk and put the Bill through in the ordinary way.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WINNIPEG AND NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 29) respecting the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.

On section 1,

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would ask you to let that Bill stand over, as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) wishes to speak upon it. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HUDSON BAY AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 43) respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.

On the preamble,

Mr. HERRON. There appears to be no definite route selected or laid out for the road proposed from British Columbia to the Hudson bay. I think we should have some assurance from the Minister of Railways that, before he will accept the plans of this railway chartered for construction purposes, the people in the different localities should be heard. The charter probably extends for a thousand miles, and we cannot tell what part of the country it is going to traverse.

Mr. CASH. I think the hon. gentleman has got this road mixed up with another. This road has been laid out, and extends from Grand Rapids almost in a direct line to Prince Albert, and from Prince Albert almost in a direct line to Calgary.

Mr. HERRON. I agree with the hon. member for Saskatchewan. I think I am mistaken, I had reference to another Bill.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—Mr. Lewis.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. Donnelly.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

To pay expenses in connection with cases before the Railway Commission, \$10,000.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Before six o'clock I was suggesting to the minister that he should appoint permanent counsel as part of the machinery of the Railway Commission. We all admit that the Railway Commission is performing a great work. We are told that the Railway Commission is composed of capable men; yet, the interests of the general public are not safeguarded as well as they would be if there were a regular counsel connected with the machinery of the board. The minister stated that he wanted to make it a layman's court, but any person who has been present at the sittings of the Railway Commission knows that it cannot possibly be a layman's court because the railway companies have skilled lawyers there. A timid layman would not go in there to present his own case and even if he did it could not be presented with the ability with which it should be presented in order to ensure success. I am speaking on behalf of the poor men, of the agriculturists, the shippers, the manufacturers, the men who are not accustomed to present their cases before the courts. You cannot get away from the fact that this is a court and that a layman cannot present his case against the skilled counsel who are there on behalf of the railway companies. There are thousands of dollars paid out every year by the public to counsel to attend before the Railway Commission and present their cases. That is a big expense that the individual has to bear. If the minister would appoint counsel to take up that work, become a part of the machinery of the board and present the cases of the public before the Railway Commission he would adopt a measure that would meet with general acceptance and one by which the country in the long run could be benefited. The time of the board would be economized and they would be able to dispose of ten cases where they can now dispose of but one. The evidence would be sent to counsel in advance and he would have the case prepared. A layman cannot prepare his case. Any person who has seen the Railway Commission at work must commend the minister for the appointment of the gentlemen who compose this board because they have been exceptionally good appointments. Generally they discard all the formality and procedure of a court but even the Chairman of the Railway Commission cannot possibly protect the interests of a poor layman because he has not studied the case. He