

## INTERCOLONIAL.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT laid on the table a statement of the unpaid claims on sections 4 and 7 of the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon Mr. AIKINS moved that the 60th rule of this House which requires that private bills should be affixed in the lobby for one week and one day respectively, be dispensed with during the remainder of the session.—Carried.

## LIBEL BILL.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH moved the third reading of this Bill as amended in Committee.

Hon. Mr. MILLER wished to present an amendment which would leave the Bill in its original condition, as a faithful copy of the English Act 6th and 7th Victoria. He thought it was not desirable to adhere to the alteration made in the 6th clause. The words he desired to re-insert were: "The particular fact or facts by reason whereof it was for the public benefit that the said matters charged should be published." He approved of this Bill, objecting only to this clause which had been altered by the expunging of the above words. The English Act rendered it necessary not only to show that it was for the public benefit the offensive matter had been published, but to state the particular fact or facts whereby it was for the public benefit the libel should have been published. He thought his amendment to restore the Bill to the condition of the English statute should not be objected to, because they were throwing over the press of a great portion of this country a protection that it had never before enjoyed. He only asked that in extending this protection they should not go further than the English law. Nobody would say our press had a higher claim to consideration than the British. Were our law the same we could have the benefit of all the English decisions and precedents. He concluded by moving the re-insertion of the above words at the 9th line of clause six.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND argued that it would be of great advantage to have our laws on all fours with that of England. He thought no member of the press could find fault with an amount of freedom and privilege equal to that enjoyed in the old country. A publisher should be obliged to show that the libel was designed for the public good and not to gratify private malice. He was strongly of opinion that the Bill should be recommitted for the re-introduction of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said that as a representative of the press, in this House, he thought proper to say that as far as the press was concerned there was no very great desire on its part to have the original words struck out. The promoter (Mr. Kaulbach) had shown him the Bill before its introduction and he was perfectly satisfied with its provisions as they stood. He did not think the matter of the amendment of very much consequence. If there was any importance attached to those words, as a newspaper man, he had not the slightest objection to their restoration; but it would be well to remember that in doing so they would be dealing with a law of the largest Province of this country on the subject of libel, which, though not entitled to any further privileges than were enjoyed by the others, contained nearly half the population of the Dominion, and had been living under its Act, passed under the direction of its Attorney General, a good many years. It had been of those codified subsequently, and seemed to have given satisfaction. These were the only grounds on which anybody thought it desirable in committee to alter the clause.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY explained why he had yielded to the desire to expunge in Committee those words from the Bill. It was thought undesirable to have any provision at variance with the Ontario statute, and with the usual form of pleading, which did not require a statement of the facts, but merely the general allegation. He agreed with the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Penny) that the amendment in itself was of little consequence, any further than it affected the Bill's passage.

After some further discussion in which Hon. Messrs. Kaulbach, Dickey, Miller, Scott, Trudel and Reesor, took part, the amendment was put to the vote resulting in a tie, there being 25 for and 25 against. His Honor the Speaker gave his casting vote against the amendment which was consequently lost, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

## BRIDGE AT NIAGARA.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON moved the second reading of a bill from the Commons respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company. He explained that the object was to bridge the Niagara between Clifton and Chippewa, at a place called Grand Island. With the completion of this project and another in contemplation by the Great Western Railway Company, there would be six bridges within a distance of thirty miles, over the Niagara, connecting