

one committee to another, and not being able to look at Bills until they were in the committee, and called upon to pass judgment on them.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that a Message be sent to the Senate, requesting their Honors to unite with this House in the formation of a Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Committee on Printing, namely:—Messrs. Baker (Missisquoi), Bergin, Bourassa, Bowell, Desjardins, Foster, Houde, Landry, McDonald (Cape Breton), Ross (Middlesex), Somerville (Brant), Tassé, Thompson, Trow, and White (Cardwell), will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 10) to provide for the amalgamation of the Bank of Nova Scotia, with the Union Bank of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 12) to amend the law with reference to procedure in criminal cases before Justices of the Peace out of Session, with relation to persons charged with indictable offences.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton), in introducing Bill (No. 11) to amend the law with reference to the trial of cases before the County Judges Criminal Court, said: The object of this Bill is to amend the law with reference to the speedy trials of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors. At present, a person in order to be tried without a jury out of session must be committed to jail on some charge. In many cases persons are not committed to jail, but are bound over to appear to answer to the charge laid; and I submit that where parties are desirous of having speedy trials, they should not, under such circumstances, be compelled to go to prison; and therefore I propose to amend the law so as to enable any person who may be charged with any such offence, and who is bound over to appear before any court of competent jurisdiction, to give notice in writing to the Crown Attorney, that he consents to and is desirous of being tried without a jury before the Judge; that when this is done, it shall be the duty of the Crown Attorney to notify the Judge within the specified time mentioned in the Bill, of such consent and desire; and that the Judge shall then appoint a day for trial; but in other respects, the law with reference to the speedy trial of persons so charged shall have effect and be in force.

Bill read the first time.

PUNISHMENT OF ADULTERY AND SEDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) to amend the Criminal Law and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person, by providing for the punishment of adultery, seduction, &c.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill, which I introduce to-day is the same Bill that was reported on by a Select Committee last Session; but after the report was made, we were unable to reach it, and consequently no action of the House

Mr. BLAKE.

could be had on it. I introduce it in the same shape as reported, and when it is printed and distributed among the members, I think that then will be the proper time for the discussion of the Bill.

Bill read the first time.

CARRIERS BY LAND.

Mr. McCARTHY, in introducing Bill (No. 14) respecting Carriers by Land, said: The Bill is one by which I propose to deal with the subject of carriers by land. At present there is a law on the Statute-book enumerating and defining the duties and liabilities of carriers by water, but, strange to say, we have no similar law with regard to carriers by land. The Bill is substantially similar to the English law dealing with the same subject. By the first few paragraphs of the Bill it is proposed that the carrier shall not be responsible for the loss or injury of parcels beyond a value of \$50 unless they are insured in the manner laid down in the Bill. It provides, also, that with regard to other articles the conditions imposed by carriers shall not govern the contract unless they are in writing and signed by the owner or shipper, and not then, unless, in case of any question arising in any court or tribunal, the demand is held to be just and reasonable. Since the year 1854, the latter provisions have been in force in England, and in that country at the present time these conditions have to be pronounced to be just and reasonable, else they are not held to be binding. In this country the railway and express companies, who are our principal carriers by land, impose no end of conditions; in fact it would take a man an hour, with the aid of a magnifying glass, to read the conditions on the back of his bill of lading. No person in transacting ordinary business can afford the time to read these numerous conditions. If he did read them he would require one or two lawyers at his elbow to help him to understand them, and even then it might be impossible. He does not generally find them out until after the loss has happened, in which case the company points out to him a series of conditions by which he finds he has agreed that notwithstanding any injury to the article he has shipped—notwithstanding, perhaps, their own gross carelessness—the risk all falls upon him and not upon them. I propose to deal with the subject in the way in which I have stated, and I can see no good reason why the carriers themselves should object to the provisions of the Bill. It makes provision with regard to carrying small parcels, and it proposes that the conditions shall be submitted and subject to the approval of the Court or Judge.

Mr. BLAKE. I think some twelve or fourteen years ago an amendment was made in our Railway Bill dealing with the reasonableness of the conditions to which the hon. gentleman has referred. We succeeded in carrying it through this House, but it disappeared in the other.

Mr. ABBOTT. I think my hon. friend should consider one point, and that is as to the competency of this Parliament to deal with contracts of that description. I think it is a grave question whether this House can interfere with conditions of contract which I think should be regulated, and I think are regulated, by the laws of the different Provinces.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not lost sight of that question. It seems to me that this is a matter coming under the description of trade and commerce, and with which therefore we can deal. We passed a law relating to carriers by water, and if we had power to pass such a law I think we have power to pass this one.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). A decision of the Court of Appeal of Ontario seems to throw some doubt on our power to deal with such a matter. That Court has just decided that the Warehouse Receipt Act, under which banks