

that gentleman's own part of the country, ship-owning was a great industry, and he would like to know whether a shipowner was to be sent to prison as a criminal because his captain had maliciously run down a ship. Let the Canadian press be ever so bad—as bad as the hon. gentleman thought, it was questionable whether its abuses or mistakes could lead to such serious results or calamities as might flow from the improper employment of locomotives on railways or of steamships, and he asked whether the law applied to the owners or managers of such property should not be the same for the proprietors of those mischievous machines—the newspapers. (Hear, hear and laughter.) The hon. gentleman said he might not know who the writer of a libel might be, but any one had the means of finding that out, as well in the case of a newspaper as in the case of a captain of a ship which was maliciously employed to do mischief. A short time ago an effort was made to lock up Mr. Brydges, in prison, for something one of his employees did near Quebec, but the thing was decided by the courts to be absurd, as Mr. Brydges was many miles away when the accident happened. His honorable friend, (Mr. Howlan) in a spirit of courtesy to the profession, to which he (Mr. Penny) still belonged, said that among other defects of this very bad Canadian press, the papers here had only one editor, while English newspapers had half a dozen editors. He (Mr. Penny) supposed the newspapers in this country were not as rich as in England; still, there were papers in Canada that had considerably more than one editor to conduct their literary business. If the press here was not as good as in England, it was because our public men were not up to the standard of England. But taking the press of Canada as it stood, he believed that of 100 libels published, not more than one could be traced to the regular editor—the majority came from outsiders. The hon. gentleman opposite, or any one might be slandered by an opponent's paper, and yet the circumstances be such that the editor knew nothing of it. But he would have recourse for all that, and the means of obtaining satisfaction. However, the press was adjudged to be so bad that, while formerly they cut off the ears and noses of literary men as a punishment for libel, it seemed they wished this spirit still continued. The hon. gentleman would confine him to his desk forever, since if he left for a moment, he would be sub-

jected to punishment for the act of his agent. An editor upon this principle could neither come to Parliament, nor, indeed could he go anywhere else, because he did not know what might happen in his absence. The House certainly would not hold him liable for acts done in a place where he was not present, and certainly would not send him to prison for an offence which he had not committed. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN argued the ship case, adduced by the hon. gentleman, was not analogous, because if his captain, with a £12,000 ship ran down one worth £100,000, he, the owner, though thousands of miles off, would be held liable for the loss.

Hon. Mr. PENNY and others—That is in a civil action, not a criminal, when the act could not be traced to you.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said the illustration was without force. He did not desire to be represented as having stated the press of the country was so very bad. What he did say was, that a portion of it was not so good as the English. The fact of 99 in 100 libels being due to others than the editor, constituted a strong argument against the hon. gentleman, and proved that editors and owners of papers ought to be more careful. This House should see that the 99 should not have the unbridled license to libel, which they enjoyed, and would continue to enjoy by the bill. He contended there was no call for this bill, as the press was very leniently dealt with at present by courts and juries.

The discussion was continued by the Hon. Messrs. Miller, Penny, Howlan, Alexander, Kaulbach, Macfarlane, Reesor, Dever, Mr. Kaulbach replying, with the result of the defeat of Mr. Howlan's amendment to strike out the 10th clause—for 11, against 15.

The Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

#### GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER moved the second reading of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's Mortgages Consolidation Bill. He said it was a permissive Bill, designed to enable the Company to arrange with the various individuals holding mortgages and other securities, and also to enable them to organize a superannuation and provident fund for the officers and servants of the Company. This measure had come from the Commons, where it was well considered by members generally and the law officers of the Crown. It exhibited certain amendments made in the