

it is quite true that in Quebec an attempt at reform was made and failed, but it is I think proper that we should call the attention of the Attorney General of the province to the fact that at the present time another effort should be made to see if the condition cannot be improved. I think the consensus of opinion exists everywhere that if the judicial forces, instead of being scattered as at present, some being overburdened in Montreal for instance and to some extent in Quebec, while in other districts they have absolute sinecures, if it were possible to concentrate the judicial forces we would obviate the necessity of making new appointments. I appreciate the difficulties of the Prime Minister and Attorney General of Quebec and that he may not be able to make the arrangements we suggest. Then it shall be our duty to consider our own position. I have taken the position formerly and it is a position we cannot avoid, that the Dominion parliament has no opinion of its own, that is, no alternative of acting or not acting; but my hon. friend will agree that if we are reduced to the position of not being able to secure reform in a province of what we consider to be an evil it may be that we will have to reconsider the whole system of judicial appointments and assign that work to the provinces or adopt some other device whereby such a condition as we have at present might be avoided. For my part I think it might be possible to avoid the necessity of more judicial appointments—no one wants to have more judges appointed than are necessary for the proper discharge of the business of the country. In the meantime we think it only right and proper that we should call the attention of the Attorney General to what we consider to be a very serious condition.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

Order No. 36 in public Bills and orders, being consideration of the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Lancaster—be now called and proceeded with.

He said: I desire to move this amendment to the motion for Supply, although I know it is not altogether usual, I placed in the hands of the Minister of Railways a copy of the proposed amendment. I am sorry to say the minister does not see his way to consent to it. This is the Bill commonly known as the Bill for the protection of the people at level crossings. It was passed unanimously by this House and was sent to the Senate on December 12 last. The Senate did not deal with it until nearly four months later, on March 31, with an amendment which I cannot discuss now, but

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

which, in my opinion, destroys the principle of the Bill. My contention is that we should consider that amendment to this important piece of legislation before we grant any more Supply. When the Bill came back from the Senate on March 31, all days but Mondays had been taken by the government for government business, the very next Monday was taken for government business and the Bill has not been reached since it came from the Senate. Of course I do not criticise the government for taking these days, but had the Senate dealt with the Bill earlier in the session it would have been called as a public Bill. Owing to their delay it has never been reached or I am sure the House would have rejected the amendment and insisted on a conference with the Senate to try to induce them to agree to what we considered in December proper legislation.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I think it would be unwise at the present stage of the session to open up the public Bills and Orders. There are several Bills on the Order Paper which it had been hoped to proceed with this session but they will all of necessity be dropped and I think it would be unwise to make an exception for this particular Bill. Therefore I ask the House not to accept the motion.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lancaster).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lewis,
Avery,	Martin
Barr,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Beattie,	Monk,
Bennett,	Morin,
Bergeron,	Northrup,
Blain,	Owen,
Borden (Carleton),	Paquet,
Boyce,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Porter,
Clements,	Pringle,
Cockshutt,	Reid (Grenville),
Crocket,	Roche (Marquette),
Daniel,	Schaffner,
Elson,	Stanfield,
Foster,	Staples,
Ganong,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Kemp,	Ward,
Lake,	Wilson (Lennox &
Lancaster,	Addington),
Lennox,	Wright (Muskoka)—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,	Lemieux,
Borden	Loggie,
(Sir Frederick),	Macdonald,
Boyer,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Brodeur,	Macpherson,
Brown,	McColl,
Caldwell,	McCool,
Calvert,	McIntyre (Perth),