

Hon. Mr. POWER—As a member of the committee I may be allowed to say a word or two. The objection taken to the composition of the Striking Committee by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, is not one which will commend itself to the judgment of this House. As stated by the hon. gentleman, this House is made up of 61 supporters of the government and 26 hon. gentlemen who are opposed to the government. I take it that whatever the complexion of the Striking Committee may be, the 61 gentlemen who support the government in this House are quite able to take care of the interests of the government side of the House; and we simply followed the old practice with respect to this committee, of not removing gentlemen from the committee, even though there is a change in the composition of the House. I remember when there was a very small body of members who sat at the Speaker's left, and when we were allowed by the great majority of that day to have a very considerable say in dealing with the patronage of the House.

In this House we should not undertake to draw party lines where they are unnecessary. If it is absolutely necessary to do so we would. With respect to the objection made by the hon. gentleman from Prince Albert, I remember that on a former occasion the hon. gentleman objected because there were not a sufficient number of members from the west on the Railway Committee; but when inquiry was made it was found that a majority of the members from Alberta and Saskatchewan were on that committee. In the present case his complaint, although made in general terms, comes down to a complaint that all the provinces are not represented on the Striking Committee, and on the Standing Orders Committee. The duty of the Standing Orders Committee is simply to see that the rules of the House have been complied with. I ask any hon. gentleman what on earth has the province from which a member comes to do with a question whether the rules have been complied with or not? When an hon. gentleman has nothing more serious to complain of than that, he has very little ground for a grievance.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Halifax)—By the death of Senator Lovitt, member from Yarmouth, there is a vacancy on the Railway Committee. By right the appointment should be from the province of Nova Scotia; but the committee in their wisdom are giving this position to a man from Ontario. I think Ontario has too much already and should allow this position to go to the province of Nova Scotia.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ACCIDENTS AT RAILWAY CROSSINGS,

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—I should like to ask the leader of the House in view of the large number of appalling accidents at railway crossings recently reported, whether any action has been taken by the government or any one representing the government?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I entirely agree with the sentiment expressed by my hon. friend. I have long felt that the carelessness of the railroads in this matter, regarding accidents which have occurred at railway crossings, should receive the attention of parliament. These accidents at railway crossings have been a disgrace to the railways and to parliament and the government. I have myself over and over again personally called the attention of the Railway Commission, and prior to that the attention of the officers connected with the Railways and Canals, to the scandalous state in which many of these crossings were in localities with which I was intimately acquainted, and deeply as I regret the loss of life which has occurred recently at several places, I believe that on the whole it will result in great good by stirring up parliament and the government to take vigorous action in the way of preventing these accidents in future. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways, has this matter in hand at this moment, and I trust I shall speedily be in a position to inform the House that proper measures have been taken to prevent the recurrence of these unhappy disasters.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock.