

Hon. Mr. BLAKE—Bill to amend the law relating to fees of Registry Offices.

Mr. TOOLEY—Bill to amend the Municipal Act.

Mr. HODGINS—Bill respecting the seizure and attachment of equitable interests.

FREE GRANT LANDS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the following resolution:—That in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council should have authority to remit the sums due to the Crown by bona fide settlers still in occupation of the lands in all the Free Grant Townships, (save and except the Townships of Alice, Grattan, Wilberforce and Mendon), and to place such settlers in the same position as those who settled in the Free Grant Townships under the Free Grant Regulations. That it is expedient to provide that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, by an order in Council, confer upon the Commissioner of Crown Lands authority to make such remissions as aforesaid, subject to the provisions of these resolutions, and subject to such provisions, if any, not inconsistent with these resolutions, as may be embodied in order in Council.

The motion was carried. Mr. DEACON gave notice that on the House going into Committee on these resolutions he should move as an amendment that the words "save and except the Townships of Alice, Grattan, Wilberforce and Mendon" be omitted.

DUAL REPRESENTATION.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR moved the second reading of the Bill to render members of the House of Commons ineligible for election to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and in doing so said he admitted that some inconvenience would result to the Administration if the Bill were passed; however a great principle was involved, and therefore the Bill he trusted would become law.

In reply to Mr. Rykert. Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that the Bill would apply to members of that Assembly after the dissolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Leeds), opposed the Bill, which he considered retrograde in character and an interference with the rights of electors. One important reason why it should not pass was that under the present law those best acquainted with the parliamentary system of Ontario were enabled to protect its rights at Ottawa. The members of the Administration who came within the scope of this Bill, had taken care to frame it in such a way that they would be able to occupy their seats through the second session of that Assembly; he thought they thus took an unfair advantage. If the Government really wish the Bill to pass, they should have provided that the election of a member to the House of Commons should vacate his seat in the Assembly.

Mr. FERGUSON also opposed the Bill as an undue interference with the rights of the people. The free will of the country should be untrammelled. There was no petition or demand for such a measure. What are the benefits expected to result from its adoption?

Mr. SEXTON said there had been no petitions against the Bill, whence it might be safely argued that the country was in favor of the measure. He had not heard any argument of importance brought against the measure.

Dr. BOULTER had heard nothing to induce him to change his opinion on this subject. The principle of dual representation was recognized in the municipal institutions of the country. The Bill was a step in the wrong direction; he should therefore vote against it.

Mr. LAUDER said the arguments now brought forward in support of this Bill were widely different from those used on previous occasions. Formerly Ottawa influence had been talked about, but now that was dropped and the House was told that it was too much to ask any man to sacrifice the time required for attendance in both Houses.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON had been surprised at the flippant way in which this measure had been introduced on this occasion. According to his Conservative views the people should not be deprived of any privilege they possessed unless that privilege had been abused. Those who in that House made themselves acquainted with the views of the province of Ontario were the best men to represent the province at Ottawa. He believed the people of Ontario were in favor of dual representation, why then should they be deprived of the right to elect whom they chose. The House had a right to have some weightier reasons why the principle involved in this Bill should be adopted. He was quite satisfied that the Government was taking a step too far. Their only reason for bringing forward this Bill seemed to be that they desired to show themselves consistent.

The House took the usual recess.

After Recess.

The debate on Dual representation was resumed:—

Mr. McCALL pointed out that the principle of this Bill had been accepted by New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, also in the United States. The opinion of the people in his constituency was in favor of the Bill. He thought it would give more independence to the House, and that there was no lack of able men to represent constituencies here or at Ottawa. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. McCALLUM characterised the Bill as a blow at the liberties of the people; if they chose to elect the same representative to both Houses, he thought they should be free to do so. He had much pleasure in opposing the Bill.

Mr. BAXTER was satisfied that the country was in favor of this measure; and his hon. friend the Premier and his colleagues were pledged to it. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. SCOTT (Grey) said if this Bill became law, the most able men in Ontario would be unable to represent them at Ottawa. The Province of Quebec would continue to send its best men there and thus Ontario would be taken at a disadvantage.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) had been much pleased with the way in which the Bill was introduced, for if there was one question on which the people had made up their minds, it was on this matter of dual representation, and therefore he was glad to find that the hon. Commissioner had

the good taste not to inflict a long speech on the House.

Mr. PRINCE was not aware that this question of representation had excited much attention in the Province—(hear, hear.)—however, he did not think that any reason why the House should not deal with the question. But, first of all, they should enquire why it was that the change was to be made.

Mr. DEROCHE thought it was for the interest of the country that dual representation should be abolished.

Mr. RYKERT said he saw that the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the hon. member for South Victoria, who formerly opposed this measure, had now changed their minds, and he could understand the reasons which they had for so doing. It might be that the reason why the hon. Commissioner of Public Works was pressing this measure was that he had an eye to the leadership of the Government when his colleagues should have vacated their seats. He should oppose the Bill as he always had done, believing that the people had a right to choose for themselves. He should therefore move in amendment,—that in the opinion of this House the said Bill interferes with the rights of the people to select such representatives as in their judgement may best advance their interest and promote the welfare of the province, and this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient and improper to take away any right or privilege enjoyed by the people without good reason, therefore this House is not disposed to proceed further with this Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR supported the Bill. The independence of the House required that the Ottawa members should be excluded.

Mr. FAREWELL also supported the Bill, and said that the late Government admitted its principle by excluding senators from that House.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said that there was one sense in which neutrality towards the Dominion parliament was a total impossibility, for the party lines in the Dominion and the Provincial Houses must be the same. The United States afforded a remarkable instance of the same kind of thing. The Government of Ontario could not, as a Government, act in alliance with or in opposition to the Government of the Dominion; but as private individuals the members of the Government had the right, and it was their duty to support that policy on the part of the Dominion, which they believed to be right. He thought there were circumstances under which it might be very important to the Province for an old Parliamentarian of the Ontario House to have a seat at Ottawa. Had that power been abused? So far as he knew, there had never been any kind of alliance between the late Premier of Ontario and the Premier of the Dominion. He should vote against the second reading.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) supported the Bill.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE reviewed the arguments brought forward by the hon. members for North Grey, Lincoln and East Toronto; and proceeded to remark that an allusion had been made to the absence of petitions, but he (Mr. Blake) thought that the people were now less in the habit of expressing their wishes by petitions, and that they preferred to leave it to their representatives to carry out their wishes. With respect to himself, motives had been imputed to him as to the course he would pursue in the Dominion Parliament; but all he had to say was, that at Ottawa he should continue to support the hon. member who now led the Opposition in the House of Commons. The late Government in an Act to better secure the independence of Parliament had disqualified senators for election to the Provincial Legislature, thus acknowledging the principle of the Bill now introduced. It was necessary for Ontario that it should have an independent legislature.

The House divided on Mr. Rykert's amendment, when the numbers were, yeas, 19; nays, 51. The amendment was therefore lost.

AYES—Messrs. Boulter, Cameron, Carling, Code, Corby, Cumberland, Ferguson, Fitzsimmons, Hildred, Hamilton, Lauder, McCallum, Macdonald (Leeds), Merrick, Prince, Rykert, Scott, (Grey), Williams (Durham), Wood, (Brant)—19.

NAYS—Messrs. Ardagh, Barber, Baxter, Beihune, Blake, Christie, Clark (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Clemens, Cook, Coyne, Craig, (Glengarry), Crooks, Crosby, Deacon, Deroche, Fairbairn, Farewell, Finlayson, Galbraith, Gibbons, Gibson, Gow, Graham, Grange, Guest, Harrington, Hodgins, McCall, McCusig, McKellar, Mackenzie, McKim, McLeod, McManus, Monk, Monteth, Oliver, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Perry, Read, Robiusion, Scott (Ottawa), Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Springer, Tooley, Webb, Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, Wood, (Victoria).—51.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole to-morrow.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:—

Bill to make further provision touching the election of members to the Legislative Assembly.

Bill to incorporate the Bowmanville, Lindsay and Bobcaygeon Railway.

Bill to appoint Trustees for certain lands at Belleville for the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland.

PETITION OF RIGHT.

The House went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Pardee in the chair, on the Bill to provide for the institution of suits against the Crown by Petition of Right, and respecting procedure in Crown suits.

The report on the Bill as amended was ordered to be received to-morrow.

PARTNERSHIPS.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to further provide for the Registration of Co-partnership and of other business firms.

The Bill was reported and ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

REGISTRY OFFICES.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill respecting the establishment of registry offices in ridings, and to amend the Registration of Titles (Ontario) Act.

The report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

COMMON SCHOOL LANDS.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the Bill relating to arrears due upon Common School Lands sold previously to 1st July, 1867.

The Daily Telegraph.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, FEB. 14, '72.

SECOND PARLIAMENT—FIRST SESSION.

TUESDAY, Feb. 13, 1872.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:15.

PETITIONS.

The following were presented:

Hon. Mr. GOW—From the County Council of Wellington, for the devising of a system of arbitration in disputes as to construction of drains, &c.

Also—From South Wellington Horticultural Society, respecting Agricultural Societies.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—From Township Council of Scugog, that the Bill to amend the charter of the Port Perry and Port Whitby R. R. may not pass in the present shape.

Mr. PRINCE—From the Town Councils of Windsor and Sandwich and others, that the Sandwich and Windsor Street Railway Bill may pass.

Mr. McLEOD—From R. Chesnut and others, of Clarke, for restrictions in the sale of spirituous liquors.

Mr. McCALL—From Township Council of Walsingham, for amendments to the laws relating to the sale of land for taxes.

Mr. PERRY—From W. Brown and others, of Blenheim, respecting the powers of the Council of Public Instruction.

Mr. CLEMENS—From Ayr, that no further territory be granted to the Long Point Co.

Mr. SMITH—From M. McDonough and others, of Adelaide, praying for the division of the county of Middlesex.

Mr. ROBINSON—From Geo. A. Kirkpatrick and others, of Kingston, for certain amendments to the Game Bill now before the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. RYKERT—Bill to amend the Registry Act.

Hon. Mr. GOW—Bill to establish Municipal Institutions in the district of Parry Sound.