

the respect and confidence of the working people nor the employers of the Province. In a modified form he thought the onus of responsibility might be justly laid on the employer; he would not say that it should not, but the measure proposed by his hon. friend would work a great injustice to the employers. It struck him as being a strange thing that the hon. gentleman who had introduced the bill should have stated that he had done so without first having consulted representatives of the class it was intended to benefit. He could not but think that it was done for political or advertising purposes. The measure was not properly thought out; it was not a complete piece of machinery. If the hon. gentleman insisted on forcing a division, he would compel men to vote against it who were as strongly in favor of legislation tending to the benefit of the workingman as the introducer of the bill himself.

Mr. Kribs thought the bill should be returned to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. Auld moved that "the bill be not now read a second time, but that its consideration be deferred with a view to further inquiry with respect to the operation of similar legislation in Great Britain, the more especially as said bill is defective in some of its most important provisions."

Advised to Withdraw.

Mr. Hoyle thought the bill ought to go back to the committee.

Mr. Miscampbell and Mr. Foy favored the bill.

Mr. Graham thought his hon. friend would do well to withdraw it.

Mr. Stratton and Mr. Lumsden opposed the principle of the bill.

Mr. Barr thought it should pass the second reading and go to the committee.

Mr. Crawford spoke strongly in regard to charges which he said had been made against him by Hon. Mr. Hardy and Mr. Conmee respectively, to the effect that he had been influenced by corporations, or was seeking glory.

Hon. Mr. Gibson did not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite wanted the bill to be read a second time and become law. The question had not been thoroughly threshed out or as carefully considered as it should be. That would require months of time. He was in favor of the principle of the bill, but in its present state the measure was revolutionary to a remarkable degree.

Hon. Mr. Hardy, in concluding the debate, said it was the first time in 25 years he had known of hon. gentlemen opposite pretending to strongly support a measure, and at the same time, without exception, apologizing for its provisions.

The Division.

The amendment was then put and carried on the following vote:—

Yeas—Messrs. Auld, Aylsworth, Barber, Blezard, Bowman, Bridgland, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Campbell, Carpenter, Charlton, Clarke, Conmee, Davis, Dickenson, Douglas, Dryden, Farwell, Ferguson, German, Gibson, Graham, Guibord, Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Hill, Hislop, Holmes, Leys, Loughrin, Lumsden, Mutrie, Macnish,

McKay, McKee, Pardee, Pardo, Petty-piece, Ross, Russell, Smith, Stratton, Taylor, Truax—46.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Barr, Beatty (Leeds), Boyd, Brower, Carnegie, Colquhoun, Crawford, Dempsey, Duff, Eilber, Fallis, Foy, Fox, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Little, Lucas, Matheson, Miscampbell, Morrison, McDonald, McLaughlin, Powell, Pyne, Read (Addington), Reid (Durham), Thompson, Wardell, White, Whitney.—35.

The following paired:—Messrs. Garrow and Carscallen, Pattullo and Hodgins, Beatty (Parry Sound) and Gallagher, Richardson and Tucker, and Malcolm and Marter.

Law of Libel.

Mr. Berkeley Powell, one of the members for Ottawa, gives notice of a bill to amend the law of libel. By section ten of the act it is provided that where a libel action is brought against a newspaper the defendant may obtain security for costs under certain circumstances. But by sub-section 1 (a) no security for costs will be decreed where the alleged libel involves a criminal charge, unless the Judge is satisfied that the action is trifling or frivolous. The newspapermen who have prompted the introduction of the bill think that this section should be struck out, and that they should be entitled to security in every case where they can show that the plaintiff is not possessed of sufficient means to answer the costs of the action, and that the statements complained of were published in good faith.

A Railway Deputation.

A strong deputation waited upon the Government in the afternoon to urge the claims for Provincial aid of the Haliburton, Whitney & Mattawa Railway. Hon. George A. Cox, Messrs. W. H. Brouse, J. W. Flavelle, John Hoskin, Wm. Mackenzie, Eugene O'Keefe, Elias Rogers and other well-known Toronto citizens are among those applying for a charter for the road. It is claimed by those interested that this railway will open up between Haliburton and the Ottawa River and make tributary to Toronto about 10,000 square miles, and as soon as the Ottawa River is reached it will add a new district of 15,000 square miles. The proposal is to run a line from Haliburton to Mattawa, 105 miles, the first section of the road to cross the Ottawa, Arnprior & Parry Sound Railway at Whitney, a distance of 35 miles from the present terminus of the G. T. R. at Haliburton. This, it is claimed, will open a new route to Pembroke and Ottawa. Pembroke would then be brought within 224 miles of Toronto, or one mile shorter than the present distance from Pembroke to Montreal. The distance between Pembroke and Toronto at the present time is 304 miles, so that when this connection is built there would be a saving of 80 miles to Toronto, also a similar saving to the other towns and villages on the Ottawa River.

Mr. J. Loughrin, M.P.P., introduced the deputation to Mr. Hardy and his colleagues, and the following gen-