

FERRIER. The mover said, as the head quarters of the Company were in Glasgow, it was thought necessary by the Committee that a statement should be made to Parliament once a year showing the amount of capital, property here, and the operations generally. Consequently the amendment introduced aimed at those objects—Passed as amended.

Act to incorporate the Canada Car Manufacturing Co.—Hon. Mr. Hamilton, of Kingston

To incorporate the Canada Paper Co.—Hon. Mr. Ryan.

THE GOLDSMITHS' BILL.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER rose to move a resolution with regard to the bill which the Banking and Commerce Committee objected to on the ground of the preamble not having been proved. Now several bills with similar provisions had been passed, and the promoters of this one felt aggrieved, imagining they had been unjustly dealt with. He was sure it was not the desire of any hon. gentleman to adopt any course calculated to create such a feeling; and with a view to dispel it, he moved that the rule requiring notice, be suspended, and bill 86, the goldsmiths' Act (of Canada) be referred back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, with a view to its re-consideration.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that although the course proposed was unusual, it was one the House might, under the circumstances, be inclined to take. He was quite sure that hon. gentleman rightly interpreted the feeling of the House in saying no member desired to act exceptionally in this matter. The House, no doubt, would accord every facility to bring and amend this measure before the committee, reserving its right of action respecting it, at a future stage. Motion carried.

RAILROAD TIME REPORTS.

On the order for the consideration of the amendments to the railway companies increased traffic accommodation bill,

Hon. Mr. OLIVIER said he could not accept the amendments reported by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and would move the bill be referred back with instruction to amend the amendments by restoring the penalty imposed by the bill. The amendments had destroyed the virtue of the bill, instead of improving it. The bill was designed to amend an Act on the statute book, requiring the railway officials at stations to put up a notice whenever a train was overdue for more than half an hour. The provisions of this statute were quite illusory.

Nobody who had suffered from an hour or two's delay ever would bring an action for damages in accordance therewith. So the new bill proposed a remedy—recourse against the station master, or other official, for punishment, in case of neglecting to give this information as to late trains to the public. Instead of action against the Company, we proposed to enable any man to sue and recover damages from those offending parties in the circuit court, or before any Justice of the Peace. While the maximum was \$20, judgment could be given for fifty or ten cents.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said the Judge might give \$20 damages also.

Honorable Mr. OLIVIER said it was left to the discretion of the court, which would no doubt always act reasonably. If the House concurred in the committee's amendments, he would rather let the bill drop. The inconvenience and annoyance occasioned by train delays, and the denial of information regarding them had been often experienced by himself and others. Nobody at a distance from Montreal would go there to sue the company, while, if an action lay against a station master in a local court, the public would avail themselves of the remedy.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said the committee gave this bill a great deal of consideration, and felt the necessity of some such regulations as were provided by it, or by the bill to which this was an amendment. He believed the Act on the statute book had not been complied with generally. He understood, however that the authorities of the Grand Trunk, Great Western and Prescott and Ottawa Railways declared that henceforth its provisions would be strictly carried out. The committee objected to a penalty for two reasons—first, because they did not think a penalty should be exacted at present, and chiefly because the clause, as it stood, provided that the penalty should go to the informer. It was felt it would be very objectionable to allow persons about a railway station, unconcerned and suffering no inconvenience or loss, but merely loitering about, probably to see whether the law was strictly complied with, to the minute or second, to bring an action against a company, and pocket the penalty. For that reason the clause was struck out, and, he was inclined to think, wisely. But, should it be proved, next session, that the Act had not been strictly complied with, he would support an amendment.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—On whom is the penalty to be imposed?