

Messrs. Carscallen, Stratton and Pattullo also explained that they had not

opposed the ferry scheme merely, but the general powers that were asked for.

Mr. Foy thought a mistake had been made in dealing only with the preamble of the bill and refusing to discuss the matter further after deciding that portion.

The motion carried.

No Junior Judge.

Mr. Hoyle continued his remarks on the motion for the second reading of the bill to prohibit the appointment of a junior Judge in the County of Ontario. He declared that he alone was responsible for the bill, and his colleagues in the Opposition were not in any way identified with it. The press of Ontario County, irrespective of politics, were against the appointment of a second Judge, and many members of the Law Reform Society thought as the speaker did.

Mr. Dryden said the necessity for a junior Judge lay in the fact that the senior Judge was often away in the northern part of the county, and owing to poor railway facilities could not travel quickly, and it was absolutely necessary that someone should be in the county town, Whitby, to conduct business in his absence.

Hon. Mr. Hardy pointed out that Mr. Hoyle proposed to amend a general law by singling out one special county. That was a rather exceptional proceeding. "My hon. friend is a great law reformer," observed Mr. Hardy; "but there is the important question of funeral reform in this country. Why does he not turn his attention to that? He knows more about it than he does about law reform. We would trust his opinions, if they were broad-minded, a good deal quicker upon funeral reform than upon law reform." (Laughter.)

Proceeding, Mr. Hardy said the power of appointing Judges was not vested in this Government but in the Ottawa Executive. It might, therefore, be properly left to the latter to decide whether there should be a second Judge in a particular county or not. The Premier produced a petition signed by practically the whole bar of Ontario County, advancing reasons why the appointment of a second Judge was necessary. At the head of the list of names appeared that of Mr. Dow of Whitby, who belonged to the same political party as Mr. Hoyle. Under the circumstances the Government could not help attaching considerable weight to the recommendation. Mr. Hardy complained of unfairness of Mr. Whitney in seeking while on the stump to create the impression that the former had reverted to the law as it formerly was before Sir Oliver Mowat introduced his bill restricting the appointment of junior Judges to counties with over 30,000 population. He gave facts showing that such an impression was erroneous.

Mr. Whitney said the Premier was utterly at sea as to his (Mr. Whitney's) stand on the question of junior Judges. He had never said, and no one had ever heard him say, that Mr. Hardy had put back the law just as it stood before. What he did say, and what he said now, was that when his hon. friend introduced the present law he made a mistake. The hon. the Attorney-General said now that he was will-

ing to leave the matter to the appointing power at Ottawa, and he (Mr. Whitney) wanted to know why he should do that when he had taken the opposite ground during a previous Administration at Ottawa.

For his part, he was willing to accept the word of the Judge of Ontario County on the special case under discussion. The bill was declared lost on division.

Workmen's Compensation.

Mr. Crawford in moving the second reading of his workmen's compensation bill said the measure had been pronounced drastic and revolutionary. The bill was not so dangerous as might appear at first. The principle was one that had been endorsed in every country in Europe. Ontario was in the rear of this social procession. In England, that great stronghold of individualism, and France as well, the principle had been adopted. The great statesmen of Europe had after studying the question arrived at the conclusion that compulsory insurance or compensation was the keynote to legislation for the good of the greatest number. If, then, it had been found to work satisfactorily in Britain and other countries, it was fitting that it should be considered by the Legislature of Ontario. It was reasonable to expect that the placing of responsibility on the employers would meet with objection from them. But it had been shown that no legislation of this character had worked satisfactorily unless the responsibility was so placed. Under the proposed bill, he contended, litigation in accident cases would be reduced to a minimum, and the cost to both workman and employer would be less than at the present time. Continuing, he said that personally and through letters a number of employers had endorsed the bill. Some changes had been made, and these, though slight, perhaps made it stronger, and he was glad to say that these changes had been made at the suggestion of employers. Speaking of the success of the principle in Germany, he said that in discussing the matter in the British Parliament in 1897, Mr. Strauss, the Cornwall representative, had quoted from German official documents figures showing that in 1888 the deaths from accidents among German workmen were seventeen per cent., but from that year down to 1897, with the compensation act in force, they were reduced to 9 per cent. It had also reduced the percentage of deaths from accident in Britain, because of the greater care taken by employers and employees alike. In conclusion he read a letter from the Page Wire Company of Walkerville, Ontario, in which the company expressed themselves strongly in favor of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis said the hon. gentleman had truly called the bill an important one. There was, perhaps, no feature of labor legislation so important as that contained in the hon. gentleman's bill. It was far-reaching in its nature, and affected workmen and artisans and also the great manufacturing industries, and therefore it could not be too carefully considered. The labor laws on the statute book of Ontario had been pronounced by competent judges to be the equal of any in