

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

THIRD PARLIAMENT---SECOND SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, 24th Jan., 1877.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:—

Mr. Creighton—From the Township Council of Normanby, to re-unite the North and South Ridings of Grey for registration purposes.

Mr. Patterson (York)—Township of York, for certain amendments to the Voters' List Act.

Mr. Patterson (York)—Toronto Street Railway Company, praying that the Bill relating to that Company may not pass.

Mr. Patterson (York)—County Council of York, praying for certain amendments to the Municipal and Assessment Acts.

Mr. Lyon—Ratepayers of Milton for the abolition of all exemptions.

Mr. McCraney—Ratepayers of Kent, for certain amendments to the Municipal Act.

Mr. Coutts—Petition to the same effect from Kent.

Mr. McCraney—Petition of 500 ratepayers of Harwick that no further time be granted for commencing work on the Erie and Huron Railway.

Mr. Coutts—Of ratepayers of Kent, for certain amendments to the Municipal Drainage Act.

Mr. Creighton—Township Council of Osprey, to reunite North and South Grey for registration purposes.

Six petitions were presented in favour of the Orange Incorporation Bill.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES.

Mr. Fraser presented the third report of the Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. Pardee presented the second report of the Committee on Railways.

PICTON HARBOUR AND ROAD JOINT STOCK COMPANY.

Mr. Brown introduced a Bill respecting the Pictou Harbour and Road Joint Stock Company. The Bill was read the first time.

TORONTO STREET RAILWAY CO.

Mr. FRASER said that before the Orders of the Day were called, it was an act of simple justice to the member for London to correct a statement regarding that gentleman which had appeared in an article in one of the city newspapers this morning. The article was headed "The Toronto Street Railway," and the statement to which he referred was in the following words:—"It is worthy of note that the Bill of last year was referred to a Select Committee, of which the member for London was chairman, and that the member for London was the solicitor of the owners of the Toronto Street Railway. It is quite possible that this fact may have nothing to do with the extraordinary metamorphosis to which the Bill was subjected, but should the one now before the Legislature be similarly referred, it would be just as well to have some other member as Chairman of the Select Committee." He (Mr. Fraser) desired to say, as Chairman of the Private Bills Committee of last session that there was no foundation for the assertion made regarding the member for London. The Bill had come before the Private Bills Committee in the usual course, had been disposed of by that Committee in the usual course, and had not been referred to a Select Committee at all. It would be remembered that the Bill had been pretty well discussed before the Committee, both on the part of the City and on the part of the Company, and after hearing the discussion, the Committee as a whole, with himself (Mr. Fraser) in the chair, came to the decision with reference to the matter which was alluded to in the article. Having come to that decision, it had been at his (Mr. Fraser's) suggestion, and with the assent of the Committee, referred to the solicitors who had appeared on the part of the city, and on the part of the Company respectively, in order that they should settle the terms of the section which would embrace the views of the Committee as decided upon; and the Committee had requested the member for London to see that these views were embraced in that section. All the member for London had to do with the matter had been this simple duty. When the section had been framed, it had been submitted again to the Com-

mittee, and had been found to contain nothing but what had been decided upon as the judgment of the Committee. Any statement to the contrary was quite opposed to the fact, and should be corrected in the fullest sense.

Mr. MEREDITH said he observed that it was stated in the article referred to by the Commissioner of Public Works, that he (Mr. Meredith) was the London solicitor for the Toronto Street Railway Company. He was not, and never had been, solicitor for that Company in the smallest transaction, or for any member of it, or for any person connected with it, directly or indirectly. He had been practising for fifteen years, and never had anything to do, in any way, with the Messrs. Kiely, who, he understood, were interested in that company.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROVINCIAL LIQUOR LAWS.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) asked whether it was the intention of Government to take proceedings as would bring before the Supreme Court for decision, the question as to the constitutional validity of Acts of the Ontario Legislature, which purported to regulate, restrict, or prohibit, the sale or traffic in fermented, vinous, or spirituous liquors.

Mr. MOWAT said one of the questions involved in a case which was lately before the Supreme Court was, or might have been, the constitutional powers of the Ontario Legislature in regard to this matter, but the Supreme Court had decided that they had no jurisdiction to try that particular case. A new case involving similar questions would be before the Court immediately, in which Mr. Severe, one of the brewers, represented his class, and the case in which his hon. friend was so much interested would probably be then decided.

LICENSE INSPECTORS IN RIDINGS WHERE DUNKIN ACT IS IN FORCE.

Mr. LAUDER asked whether the Government intended to appoint or re-appoint license commissioners and inspectors for counties, or the various ridings of counties in which the Act usually called the Dunkin Act was in force.

Mr. MOWAT—We do.

UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT FUND.

Mr. LAUDER moved for, 1st, a statement of all property belonging to the Endowment Fund of the University of Toronto, University College, and Upper Canada College. 2nd. Statement of the income derived from said property from 1867 to 1876, inclusive, showing separately the income for each year. 3rd. Also, the annual expenditure in detail of said funds respectively, during the same period. It was the duty of the bursar of these institutions to present a statement of the finances to the Lieut. Governor in Council, but no such return appeared to have been made since Confederation except in 1868-9, and that was not printed. He saw no reason why a statement of the fund should not be published along with the other Provincial accounts each year. The officials were Provincial officers, appointed by the Lieut. Governor, and the House ought to know the amount of their salaries.

Mr. CROOKS said he quite agreed with the purport of the motion. It was clearly an oversight that the requirements of the statute had not been complied with. The Institution was as public as any department of the Government, and it was important that all matters connected with it should be understood, which they could not be unless they were brought down and printed.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said he should have thought the financial operations of the Institution should be under the control of the Minister of Education.

Mr. CROOKS said there need be no delay in bringing down the returns.

Mr. MACDOUGALL asked who was responsible for the management of the University estate.

Mr. CROOKS said all such matters rested with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and were regulated by Orders in Council. The responsibility rested with the Government of the day.

The motion passed.

RIVER TRENT WORKS.

Mr. FERRIS moved for a return of the correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario, relating to the transfer of the River Trent Works to this Province by the Dominion Government. He said he desired to ascertain the ground on which the Dominion Government had opposed the transfer of