

Hon. Mr. WOOD said that in a partial sense the principle of this Bill was that in the case of certain specified debts, the creditor may, immediately upon the debt being credited by process, bind for the payment of that debt all the property of the debtor. Now he would ask was the House in favour of such an important principle? If that was to be the principle governing the relations between debtor and creditor, it was well that they should know it.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the lien only covered the property improved.

Mr. WOOD said he had used the words "in a partial sense."

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said the vendor always had a lien until he was paid.

Mr. WOOD said that perhaps a grocer had a lien on a pound of tea or a pound of sugar he sold until he delivered it, but after the purchaser had it in his possession the lien was not of much use. Now, for instance, the member for South Ontario was a general dealer—a man came to him and bought from him nails and paint and iron, and used them in building a home; he, at the same time, bought pork and flour and groceries. According to this law, the h. n. member would have a lien upon the whole of the house for payment of the nails, &c., and yet on the groceries he would have no claim except by common law. Surely that was not proper legislation. If the introduction of this Bill was inspired by the same spirit which had led a gentleman to go to Hamilton and make the mechanics there believe he was their friend, then the honourable member for East Toronto was justified in his amendment, as he out-Heroded Herod and made the whole thing ridiculous. The mechanic had as much remedy under the present law as any other class; in fact, more so, because the sympathy of his fellow workmen and the sense of self-interest and the fear of public opinion, made the non-payment of mechanics by their masters very exceptional. If this matter was to be gone into at all it must be gone into systematically, and a provision made that every debt must be settled immediately or the property of the purchaser shut up immediately. The sense of the House would surely not make so grave an inroad on the credit system under which three-fourths of the trade and manufacture of the country was carried on.

Mr. BETHUNE observed that mercantile men had special legislation in the Insolvent Act.

Mr. WOOD—It is only as a matter of convenience that the Insolvent Act is tolerated at all.

Mr. BETHUNE said it was the same in this case. It was no new principle that was sought to be established. If a waggon-maker repaired a carriage he had a lien upon it till his account was paid. It was true that he lost his lien when he let the carriage go out of his possession; but, in the case of the building of houses, the builder could not keep possession of the house, and therefore could not keep his lien. The object of the Bill, therefore, was to place the lien upon a reasonable basis.

Mr. DEACON said the impression was that the Bill was only to give mechanics, machinists, builders, and so on, a lien, but it would also give a lien to those parties who furnished material for the erection of buildings, and so forth. He was entirely opposed to the principle of the Bill, and would therefore move that the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to so amend it that the operation of the Bill be restricted to the City of Toronto. (Laughter.)

Mr. MERRICK suggested a verbal alteration, so as to make the provision apply only to builders and not to merchants who supplied materials.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS thought Mr. Deacon must be joking in proposing his amendments. If it was passed it would be a great injustice to the mechanics of Ontario. He had seen instances in which mechanics were unable to get their wages, although their employers drove about in their carriages and fared sumptuously.

Mr. McMANUS thought the Bill was not needed in the rural districts, and if Mr. Deacon would change his amendment so as to include the other cities and towns he would support it.

Mr. OLIVER was aware that there was a similar law in force in the State of Michigan, and it worked well. He had been an advocate for such a Bill ever since he had a seat in the House, and he would be happy to see the measure carried through as it was, and the amendments voted down.

Mr. PAXTON was in favour of the prin-

ciple of the Bill, and held that its provisions should apply to the whole country. It would have a very beneficial effect, but he was not in favour of lowering the amount for which a lien should be given under ten dollars.

Mr. WOOD (Brant) held that it was possible that cases might arise where claims might be satisfied, and yet the parties would refuse to discharge the liens, and it would be as well to make provision for such cases.

Mr. CAMERON thought the Bill would be inoperative and would benefit no one; but he thought it should apply to labourers as well as to contractors. The Bill was a species of class legislation, and should never pass.

Atty.-Gen. MOWAT observed that the member for East Toronto held that the Bill was a bad one, and yet he wanted it made more extensive in its operation. That any one should say the principle of the Bill was bad, and yet want it extended, was something to him altogether unintelligible. It was said this was class legislation. The law provided special provision for the recovery of rent, and he could not see why there should not be special provision for the recovery of wages. If there was any difference it was in favour of the latter. It was hard for a working-man, depending on his daily wages, to be cheated out of them through the dishonesty of his employer, and he was prepared to go any proper length to prevent that. Last year his hon. friend the Treasurer had introduced this Bill, and he had placed a limit of \$50, under the impression that without that limit he could not get the Bill passed. He thought that the removal of the limit altogether could do no harm, because a lien for a small amount would not, except in special cases, be established on account of the expense. This measure had been tried in other countries and been found to work satisfactorily, and not to encumber unnecessarily real estate. There was no object to be gained by fixing the limit at \$5. If it was to be reduced to that figure, it would be better to abolish it altogether.

Mr. Deacon's amendment having been ruled out of order, the amendment of Mr. Crooks, abolishing the limit altogether, was carried. The House went into Committee, (Mr. Hodgins in the chair), adopted the amendment and reported the Bill.

Mr. CROOKS moved the third reading of the Bill.

The House divided on the motion, which was carried. Yeas—61. Nays—10.

Yeas—Mowat, Crooks, Scott, (Ottawa), McKim, McKellar, Pardee, Gow, Williams, (Hamilton), Hodgins, Oliver, Baxter, Clemens, Farewell, Cook, Webb, Spinger, Clarke (Wellington), Smith, Gibbons, Gibson, Striker, Paxton, Patterson, Crosby, Wilson, Christie, Sexton, McRae, McLeod, Clarke (Norfolk), Cameron, Macdonald, Wells, Prince, Grange, Meredith, Merrick, Boulter, Rykert, Lauder, Snetsinger, Williams (Durham), Graham, Robinson, Watterworth, Sinclair, Hamilton, Corby, Fitzsimmons, Reed, Calvin, Tooley, Monteith, Code, Caldwell, Gifford, Finlayson, Haney, Scott (Grey), Deroche, Monk—61.

NAYS—Ferguson, Ardagh, Harrington, Wood (Brant), McManus, McCall, Deacon, Wood (Victoria), Dawson, Fraser—10.

Mr. Fairbairn, for the Bill, had paired with Mr. Boulton; and Mr. Barber, also for the Bill, not being in the Chamber at the time the motion was put, was not allowed to vote.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

DRAINAGE WORKS.

On motion of Mr. McKELLAR, a Bill to authorise the investment of certain moneys in debenture to be issued for the construction of drainage works by municipalities, was read a third time and passed.

DEAF AND DUMB AND BLIND.

On motion of Mr. FARDEE, a Bill respecting institutions for the education and instruction of the deaf and dumb and the blind in Ontario, was read a third time and passed.

TELEGRAPH MESSAGES.

On the question of receiving the report of the Committee on the Bill to facilitate the proof of telegraph messages, letters, and other written documents,

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved that the report be not now received, but that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the reading of it so that persons might be enabled by means of a notice to require proof of an original document.

The motion was agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. Hodgins