

these crossings in such a manner as the Railway Commission think is necessary? That is the object of this Bill. Without this Bill, neither the Railway Commission nor anybody else can compel these companies to protect their crossings. I find that the railway companies have induced the newspapers to say that this Bill is a measure to compel the railways to reduce their speed to ten miles an hour. Sir, it is no such thing. I might as well be charged with introducing a Bill to hang people because I want people to be hanged who have committed murder. If the railway companies be not willing to go to the Railway Commission and have such orders made as the commission, in its judgment, deems it advisable to make, if these companies defy public opinion and will not ask the Railway Commission to declare what sort of protection is needed at level crossings, then they must be under the penalty of not running faster than ten miles an hour, at these crossings, so that people may have some chance of escaping being run over. If these railway companies will not do anything to prevent the destruction of lives at these level crossings, it is something terrible to say to them: At all events, if you will not do that, you must run slow enough to give people a chance to get out of your way. As the Hon. Geo. W. Ross said in the Senate, the speed of railway trains is all the time increasing.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a debate in the other House, and it is a well known rule of parliamentary law that is not permissible.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose I can refer to the action of the other House. The Senate, has, by its action, practically said that this legislation is not necessary, or rather it has said—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not like to press too strongly but it is laid down explicitly in Bourinot as the unwritten law of parliament that no reference can be made to a debate in the other House:—

It is a part of the unwritten law of parliament that no allusion should be made in one House to the debates of the other chamber, a rule always enforced by the Speaker with the utmost strictness. Members sometimes attempt to evade this rule by resorting to ambiguous terms of expression—by referring, for instance, to what happened in another place, but all such evasions of a wholesome practice should be stopped by the Speaker, when it is evident to whom the allusions are made.

I think we had better strictly follow that rule.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not want to break the rule by any means or device.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That rule is not always strictly followed in the British House of Commons. For instance, Sir Henry

Campbell-Bannerman referred directly to proceedings in the House of Lords on a certain Bill and moved a resolution regarding it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice I have cited seems to be the practice followed under our procedure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is absolutely necessary to refer to proceedings in the Senate when Bills come back to us from that body. It may not be necessary to refer to their debates, but we must refer to their proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule laid down seems to be that an hon. member cannot take the debates of the other chamber and quote from them. No reference to what has occurred in the other chamber can be made. That seems to be the rule laid down in our practice.

Mr. LANCASTER. Am I at liberty then to read verbatim what the Hon. Geo. W. Ross said in the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is permissible to quote from the records of the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is the Senate debates to which I am referring. The Hon. Geo. W. Ross said:—

I had the honour of supporting this measure when it came first before the House, and am of the opinion still that it is a good Bill. My hon. friend from Montreal says it is not well drafted, and in proof of that assertion he compares this Bill with the Railway Act. I understand the Railway Act, as it is now on the statute-book, is practically the same as the Act passed in 1903. This Bill now before us went before the House of Commons in its present form in 1906 and also in 1907. It passed through the hands of two different Ministers of Justice, the highest legal authority in the House of Commons or in the country, extra judicial of course, and of the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and the present Minister of Justice, Mr. Aylesworth. As to the members of the House, I would assume that they would see that the Bill was consistent with itself. I would assume that their opinion should carry a good deal of weight. It does with me. I would assume that they would not allow a Bill to go through the House inconsistent with itself or that was badly drafted, or in any sense a bungled Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) permit me? I find in Bourinot, page 479, a statement of what may be referred to.

It is perfectly regular, however, to refer to the official printed records of the other branch of the legislature even though the document may not have been formally asked for and communicated to the House.

I do not know whether the document from which the hon. gentleman is quoting is the official printed record or not. I should think not from its appearance. But, if he assures me that it is the official printed record, of course, I accept his statement.