

violence have been committed lately which we all regret, but they are no worse than crimes which are committed every day in many parts of the United States, and I do not think it is right to say, as we do in the preamble of this Bill, that crimes of violence are so numerous in the country, as to call for exceptional legislation. I say it is not so. The people of Canada are as orderly and law-abiding as any population in the world. The preamble should, therefore, be dropped from the Bill. If it should appear in its present shape on our Statute Books, it will at some future period in the history of the country be pointed to as evidence of the prevalence of crime in Canada. While I admit the Bill may be very useful, it seems to me some provision should be made for enforcing it promptly, if occasion call for it, in the distant Provinces. I would suggest that the local authorities of British Columbia and Manitoba should be vested with the power which is conferred upon the Governor-in-Council. Telegraphic communication with those Provinces is through the United States, and the distance from the capital is very great.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—I hope this Bill will receive the support of the House. In one city we find men being shot down in the streets, and there is a feeling of insecurity among the people. I am very glad the Government have introduced this Bill, and I hope they will accept the amendment that has been proposed.

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER—With reference to the preamble of the Bill, unfortunately we have too much reason to say that crimes of violence are committed in one of our cities, and we have reason to fear that matters will be worse before long. As to the other suggestion of the hon. Senator from Manitoba (Mr. Girard) that we should empower the local authorities in Manitoba and British Columbia to put this law in force if circumstances should require it, I think it would be unwise. This will not be a permanent Bill, and, I hope, even for this year, after the precautions we have taken, it will not be necessary to enforce it.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Belrose in the Chair.

On the 6th clause,

Hon. Mr. RYAN moved in amendment that the words "exceed five in number" be struck out.

The motion was agreed to.

On the 10th clause,

Hon. Mr. RYAN moved, page 2, line 45, leave out from "determine" to "the," where it occurs the first time in page 3, line 7, and insert

"10. Whosoever is charged with having committed any offence against the provisions of the third section of this Act may be tried and dealt with by three Justices of the Peace, or by any functionary or tribunal invested by the proper Legislative Authority, with power to do alone such acts as are usually required to be done by two or more Justices of the Peace in pursuance of the Act passed in the Session held in the thirty-second and thirty-third years of Her Majesty's reign Chapter Thirty-one, intitled: 'An Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, in relation to summary convictions and orders.'"

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he should have preferred to have left the tenth clause as it was, as the liberty of the subject would have been better protected. This amendment would give extraordinary powers to magistrates. Of course all the circumstances connected with this Bill were exceptional. The three magistrates might be a fair tribunal, or they might not, and the Police Magistrate might be a prejudiced individual one way or the other. This was a most delicate measure, and it would be necessary to have the concurrence of the people that the powers the Legislature were conferring on the Judiciary were vested in magistrates above suspicion who would be able to hold the scales of justice fairly on the most delicate questions when the public were drawn into the vortex one way or the other. He was free to confess there were advantages in having justice quick, sharp, and decisive if it were possible to be sure of the tribunal, and to convince the people that the judge was without prejudice one way or the other. But otherwise the people who supposed their rights were taken away from them would say

The Bill was read the second time.

Hon Mr. Girard.