

how the bill would work, and moved the second reading.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD said his opinions on the subject were still precisely what he had formerly expressed. He trusted the House would never sanction the principle introduced in the bill. It would have the effect of shaking the confidence of the people in the stability of the laws by which they held property.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the Bill did not introduce any new principle, and maintained that it would have a beneficial effect.

Hon. Mr. WOOD supported the Bill, the principle of which he held had been settled by the highest legal authorities of the Empire. It did not propose to deprive the owner of anything which belonged to him. While agreeing in the principle of the Bill he did not agree with all the arguments which had been brought forward in support of it. He thought, however, it would be safer to leave the matter to be adjudicated upon by a court of equity rather than by a jury, which he thought might be liable to be affected by particular influences.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON had not quite understood whether this was a bill introduced by the Government or by the President of the Council.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that the Government was not necessarily bound to approve of measures introduced during the time of the late Administration by the members of the Government who did not bind themselves to support the details of the bill.

Mr. CAMERON recollected when the hon. gentleman had been very indignant at any interference with the rights of property. Suppose the case of a man who died leaving his property to his infant child; and that improvements were made in the property by the party in charge of it; and in the event of the minor being unable to meet the claim for improvements; he would be deprived of any benefit from it. It had been assumed that because he was a Conservative he would oppose the bill, but his principle was to oppose any interference with private rights unless there was good reason for doing so. Some times isolated cases of apparent injustice would occur under the existing law, but it was better to let the law remain as it was than to be always tinkering the law to meet each particular case. He maintained that a Court of Equity would provide all that was required to meet such cases without any alteration in the law. An allusion had been made to the small minority in which he (Mr. Cameron) had been lately placed, but he would prefer to be left in that minority rather than gainsay the opinions he had formerly expressed. He would not oppose the second reading but should try to improve the Bill in committee.

Mr. PRINCE thought there was a grievance to be met and that it was time to deal with it; and described particular instances in which he considered injustice would arise. This bill proposed to rectify these injustices; and the objections brought were not against the principle but against the mode of carrying it out.

Mr. LETHUNE sincerely hoped the bill would become law. There was no novel principle introduced in this Bill the provisions of which were already incorporated in the law of Lower Canada. It might be desirable to introduce in Committee some clause to more completely protect the rights of minors.

Mr. BOULTBEE urged the House to give very careful consideration to the principle of the Bill before allowing it to pass. He could imagine that considerable difficulties would occur in the working of this bill, owing to the rapid fluctuations in the value of land in this country. In the case of a railway traversing the property of an absentee land owner, very considerable injustice might be done.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN thought this was a thoroughly Reform measure, and was gratified to find a measure of that kind emanating from the hon. Premier. An imaginary case had been presented by the hon. member for Cornwall, but the bill was not intended to protect people against the results of their own carelessness. The object of the Bill was to protect the person who improved land under a mistake of title when due prudence had been used. A number of cases had been brought before their notice, but the principle was as well indicated by one example as by a hundred. Much had been said about the expensive nature of law proceedings, but he thought it time for the members of that profession to stand on its defence. It was, he maintained, the worst paid of all professions.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to a select committee.

FRAUDULENT DEEDS.

Mr. BLAKE moved the second reading of a Bill "To declare the true construction of the Act passed in the 13th year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth and chaptered five and entitled 'an act against fraudulent deeds, alienations, &c,'" and in doing so described the differences of opinion which had arisen as to the interpretation of the Act in question.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said that several cases had recently come before his notice, in which the difficulty referred to had arisen.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD was not going to oppose the second reading, but he had taken it that the law was settled. The Atty.-Gen. had not made out a case for the Bill.

Hon. E. B. WOOD said there were three classes of cases to which the Act would apply. No three of three Judges could agree as to what was the real meaning of the provisions of the Statute.

Hon. M. C. CAMERON thought that because a particular rendering of the words was suitable for this country, it was rather hard to say that that was the intent of an Act passed three hundred years ago under widely different circumstances. He would not, however, oppose the second reading. The method proposed would, instead of settling the matter, merely open the door to innumerable difficulties; it would not have the effect of preventing objectionable transactions, but might pre-

vent many transactions which were not objectionable.

Hon. S. RICHARDS thought it strange that this Legislature should be called upon to define the meaning of this Act in a contrary sense to the definition lately given by the highest legal authority in the land. It seemed to him to be highly improper for the Legislature to pass the Bill in its present state. It was an extraordinary assumption of power to dictate to the British Legislature the real interpretation of a statute created in the House of Commons.

The Bill was then read a second time and deferred to a Select Committee.

THE LEGAL STATUS OF MARRIED WOMEN.

The ATTY.-GEN. moved the second reading of a Bill "to extend the legal capacity of married women," and observed

that the law in its present state did not sufficiently protect the property of a married woman as against her husband. The object of the Bill was to secure to a married woman the full enjoyment of any property which she might hold in her own right. This Bill was, in some respects, identical with recent legislation of the British Parliament in this respect, and would render a woman entirely independent of her husband as far as her own earnings were concerned. He was pleased to find how far the act of the Imperial Legislature went in that respect. He had framed the Bill when occupying a seat on the opposite side of the House and when he had not the advantage of being able to refer to the act of the Imperial Parliament; and he should move on the third reading to add a clause from that Act for the purpose of protecting creditors against fraudulent transfers.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON thought the Bill might have very objectionable results in its effects on the relation between husband and wife. It was very questionable whether it was advisable to separate the interests of each in so complete a manner as to render them absolutely independent of one another.

Hon. E. B. WOOD thought the hon. Atty.-General had better take up the whole question of the legal position of married women, who under the present law were debarred from almost every employment of their property.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to a Committee.

DEBTS AND CHOSES IN ACTION.

The hon. ATTY.-GENERAL moved that the order with reference to the assignation of debts be discharged as a private member of the House had introduced a Bill to a similar effect.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON thought that if the Government had decided upon a particular policy with respect to this matter, the Government Bill should be proceeded with and not the private Bill.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said the Government would support the Bill of the hon. member for West Elgin.

The order was then discharged.

The House adjourned at 10:30 to this day (Wednesday) at 8 o'clock.

ENQUIRIES AND NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Monk—On Thursday—To enquire whether or not it is the intention of Ministers during the present session to take any steps towards the establishment of one or more Normal Schools in this Province.

Mr. Fairbairn—On Thursday—Address for a list of all qualified Justices of the Peace in this Province now acting or intitled to act.

Mr. Grange—On Thursday—Enquiry of Ministry whether they propose during this session introducing a measure amending the jury law, abolishing grand jury and making magistrates eligible in petit juries.

Hon. Mr. McDonald—On Thursday—Address for the names of all parties or firms holding timber licences in Ontario, on the first of January, instant, setting forth the localities of the same, the area covered by each license, the date of each and of any assignment of such license, the bounties paid for each, and also a statement of all sums in arrear and unpaid to the Crown by such license holders up to the said date, and the date when such arrears fell due, together with copies of any correspondence between the Crown Lands Department and any license holder in arrears demanding payment of the same.

Mr. Fitzsimmons—On Thursday—Enquiry of Ministry whether or not it is the intention of the Government to introduce during the present session a measure for the adjournment of the liabilities of the municipalities which borrowed under the Municipal Loan Funds Acts and for the relief of the said municipalities.

Mr. PERRY—On Thursday—Address asking for a return giving a list of the names and residences of the Coroners in this Province.

Mr. SCOTT (Grey), on Thursday—Enquiry of Ministry if it is their intention to bring before the House, during the present session, any measure or scheme, having for its object the development of an increased immigration into this Province; and if their answer is in the affirmative, then to name a day on which they will be prepared to submit such measure or scheme to the House, together with all particulars as to appointment of agents and otherwise.