

# LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO.

## SECOND PARLIAMENT—THIRD SESSION.

FRIDAY, March 6.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

### REPORTS PRESENTED.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE presented the 9th Report of the Committee on the School Bills.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS presented the 9th Report of the Standing Committee on Railways, and moved its adoption.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT presented the Report of the Select Committee on the School Bills.

### BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. RYKERT introduced a Bill to amend the Franchise.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

Hon. Mr. FRASER brought down papers and correspondence regarding the following Railways:—Cobourg, Peterborough, and Lake Marmora, and Hamilton and Lake Erie; also relating to the application of the Victoria Railway Company for aid; also returns of concessions and townships located in the Free Grant Districts for the years 1873 and 1874, with the names of the locatees.

### NEWSPAPER REPORTS.

Mr. LAUDER rose and called attention to a Report of the proceedings of one of the Standing Committees of the House yesterday, which appeared in one of the newspapers, and which purported to state that language was used by a member of that Committee of an indecent and disorderly kind. He did not complain of a report in THE GLOBE, and he cared little what that newspaper said about him; nor yet did he care what any member of the Government or any of their supporters said about him, so long as they were within the rules of Parliament. He took exception to this report, however, because it said that Messrs. Cameron and Richards concurred that the remarks made use of were indecent and disorderly, and he did value the opinion of those hon. gentlemen. If the Standing Committees of the House were to be brought into contempt, the House should know it. The report was, no doubt, conceived with a view to injure him personally as a member of the Standing Committee, and he did not think that the hon. member for South Brant used anything like the language attributed to him, and certainly neither Mr. Cameron nor Mr. Richards agreed in any such expressions.

Mr. STEPHEN RICHARDS said when the hon. member for South Grey had said that the evidence of the witness under examination did not agree with that of another

witness, and one of them must be perjurers, he had said simply that there must be some mistake.

Mr. PRINCE said the reporters reported them all very badly, but it reminded him of the case of a member of Parliament who complained that what he was reported to have said was nonsense, and received for reply that had what he said been reported it would have been much greater nonsense. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDY said he was afraid he should have to plead pretty nearly guilty to the language attributed to him. He believed the language used by him was that it was highly improper that such language should be used to a gentleman under oath, and he drew the attention of the Chair to the matter. So far as he remembered, his hon. friend from Niagara, when appealed to, concurred in that view. The other portions of the report, so far as he could remember, were perfectly accurate.

Mr. McLEOD said his hon. friend from South Brant had further appealed to the hon. members for Niagara and East Toronto to say whether such language would be allowed in a Court of Justice.

### BALLOT EXPENSES.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT moved "That the House will on Monday next resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following resolution:—'That the reasonable expenses incurred by the returning officer and by the other officers and clerks, for printing, providing polling compartments, transmission of the packets required to be transmitted by the proposed Act respecting voting by ballot, and reasonable fees and allowances for services rendered under the said proposed Act, shall be paid to the returning-officer out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province, and shall be distributed by him to the several persons entitled thereto; which distribution he shall report to the Lieutenant-Governor, through the Provincial Secretary.'" Carried.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT moved the third reading of the Bill respecting Benevolent, Provident, and other Societies.

Mr. MERRICK, having recapitulated the facts concerning the progress of the Orange Bills last year, complained that, although the correspondence with the Dominion Government had been brought down, it had not been printed, and the letters laying the matter before that Government at Ottawa, so far as he had been able to see, were not among the papers. He spoke of the Prince Edward Island Orange Bill, and contended that the circumstances were different altogether from this case. He held that the Orange body had a right to demand such legislation at the hands of the House in view of what took place last year, and he asserted that the Bills should have been assented to by the Lieutenant-Governor. He charged the Premier with pandering to a section of the people hostile to the Orange Bills, and with being much less careful for the interests of the Empire than he (Mr. Mowat) had endeavoured last night to make the House believe. He was opposed to the Bill because it allowed Societies to hold such large portions of land, and he contended that the principle was dangerous, and had been objected to and fought against by the people of this country in the past. He quoted the clause of the Bill referring to the holding of property, and he charged the Government with being afraid to take the responsibility of giving incorporation to any Society, reading in proof of the assertion the provision which gives the power to county judges to examine the constitution of bodies applying for corporate powers, and approving or disapproving of them as the case might require. He complained that it would cost a great deal to incorporate under the Bill, and he further objected to it, because he could not express his views upon the incorporation of other bodies. He moved the six months' holdst.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said the hon. gentleman had not accurately stated what he (Mr. Mowat) had said upon the question. The Bill was a general one, not intended specially for the Orange Societies, and would have been introduced even had there been no Orange Bills. The excitement created over these Bills last year, however, had caused him to give greater attention to their case than they would in all probability have otherwise received. The hon. gentleman complained, not that the Bill was not liberal enough, but that it was too liberal, and the people well knew what the purpose of these petty objections were—not on account of the