bates which took place on this subject in 1868, saying that they showed that the Reform party of that time desired to go much farther in the way of liberalizing the Free Grant Act than he desired to go. He also quoted from an editorial article in THE GLOBE of Feb. 6th, 1868, in which it was stated that the Bill was too stringent, and that it should be modified in a few years so as to give greater inducements to the settlers.

Mr. PARDEE thought that the hon. member for Muskoka had scarcely made out his case, and thought the measure he advocated would doubtless prove a very popular one with the present settlers in that district. It would prove ruinous to the free grant system and to future settlers. If this Bill passed speculators would go in and get the best lands, and those who occupied under the free grant system would have to pay more than if they had bought the lands from the Government. Only about fifty per cent. of the lands were fit for actual settlement. There were about 50,000 acres in an average township. A settler received 200 acres free and could purchase 100 acres more, his sons received 100 and could purchase another 100, so that if there were three sons in the family the head of it could locate and buy some 900 acres, and it would only take fifty families to monopolize a township. One of the greatest difficulties the Department had now to contend with was to prevent parties from taking advantage of the *bona fide* settler. Last year the Government laid out lands near the Dawson Road. If this Bill were to become law, a very few people could take up all these lands and make the improvements provided for, and then the people who desired to become *bona fide* settlers would have to buy them out. It would be better to abolish the Free Grant system altogether and sell the lands at from $1 to $2 an acre rather than to allow people to go in, obtain the lands, and sell them for whatever they could extort from the settlers. There was one township of excellent land not open for location, which was now filled with squatters. A company wanted to buy the whole township from the Government at $2 an acre, but if parties could take it up and assign it at the end of six months speculators would have got it, and *bona fide* settlers would have had to pay for it. The Free Grant Act, which was also a Homestead Act, had been an entire success, and should not be changed, but, if this Bill became law, Ontario would have no free grant system at all. In the laws of the Dominion, the United States, and New Brunswick strong provisions were made against assignments. No case in which the improvements had been sacrificed had happened, or could happen. He hoped the Bill would be withdrawn, as no good could come from it, but every evil, and in fact it would destroy the free grant system of Ontario.

Mr. DEROCHE said, after what he had heard, this Bill would be detrimental to the free grant townships. It would give rise to a large floating population who would make a business of the thing, instead of encouraging *bona fide* settlement. It might be easily worked in the interest of the lumbermen. The cases of persons who were of the greatest advantage to the free grant township were those who settled with the intention of remaining and did remain. He had never found any case of hardship which had not been dealt with fairly by the respective Commissioners of Crown Lands, and he therefore saw no reason for passing this Act which would open a field for speculation which it was not desirable to have opened. When a law worked well, they ought to be Conservative enough not to try some other mode of which they knew nothing.

Mr. DEACON said the only arguments advanced by the mover of the Bill were those held by the present Government when they were in Opposition, not those which they held now. He (Mr. Deacon) had moved a resolution in this direction last session, when the member for Muskoka spoke and voted against him, and he believed the hon. gentleman had been called to account by his constituents for his vote. Since that the Government had passed an order in Council which satisfied him (Mr Deacon). This Act was not only a free grant law but a homestead law, and hon members should remember that the country spent a great deal of money in opening up the free grant sections. The least that could be expected in return was that the settlement should be *bona fide* and not only *prima facie*. This Act would be destructive of the free grant system, and he should therefore vote against it.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he was not aware that supporters of the Government had ever been in favour of the principle of this Bill. He was sure the whole House would be willing to aid to any reasonable extent the settlers in these free grant territories, but this Bill would lead to undesirable results.

Mr. BOULTER expressed the opinion that the proposed amendments would prove the ruination of the free grant system by encouraging speculation. If the hon. member for Muskoka could show that there were cases of hardship among the settlers which could not be settled by the Commissioner, he would have some argument for the Bill. He (Mr. Boulter) would vote against the Bill.

Mr. MILLER said that as the House was, he believed, united against him, he would withdraw the Bill, with the intention, however, of presenting it at another session.

The Bill was withdrawn.

BETTING ON ELECTIONS.

Mr. CURRIE moved the second reading of the Bill to prevent betting or wagering at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly. He said that the necessity for some such measure was, he believed, pretty generally felt after the experience which had been had in some of the election cases in the Province. A similar measure to the one he proposed had been in force in the State of New York, and had been found to work well. The Bill prohibited betting on elections under a penalty of $100, and the person betting should not be entitled to vote. The Bill was a very short one, and if the second reading was carried, he proposed to refer it to a Special Committee.

Mr. MEREDITH said that when a similar measure had been introduced into the House before he had opposed it, as had the present Commissioner of Public Works. If the Bill was passed in its present shape it would do more harm than good. Under the present Act it had been decided that a person making a bet on an election for the purpose of improperly influencing it, should be held to be guilty of a corrupt practice within the meaning of the Act and punishable accordingly. There was far less liability to the practice of betting under the ballot system than when the voting was open.

Mr. FRASER said that he had voted against a measure similar to this when it was introduced before, and he intended voting against the Bill before the House because he believed it was more calculated to produce the objectionable practice than to prevent it. The Bill did not propose to make betting a corrupt practice. In the case of a close vote, as in the election of the hon. member for West Peterboro', if the proposed Bill were in force it would be a very easy thing to have the election upset by the opposite candidate taking three or four bets with various parties in the constituency. The betting itself would not be regarded as corrupt, and the only penalty upon the person engaging in the bets would be the loss of his own vote (which was not likely to be cast in any case) and a fine of $100. A scrutiny would be demanded, and the result would be that a candidate with a small majority would, through no fault of his own or his agents, have his election avoided. He hoped the House would not allow the Bill to become law.

The motion was lost on division.

MORTGAGES AND SALES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.

Mr. DEACON moved the second reading of the Bill "To extend Cap. 45 of the Con. Stat. for Upper Canada, intituled, 'An Act respecting Mortgages and Sale of Personal Property' to the districts of Muskoka, Parry Sound, Thunder Bay, and Nipissing." He explained that the intention of the Bill was that instruments of mortgage and sale in these districts should be filed with the Registrar instead of with the Clerk of the Division Court, and to make other amendments to the Act which experience had shown to be necessary.

Mr. MOWAT said that though there were some provisions of the Bill which were of an *ex post facto* character as well as objectionable intrinsically. He had no objection to its being read a second time and referred to a select Committee.

The motion was carried, the Bill read a second time and referred to the following Committee: Messrs. Miller, Dawson, Derochie, Meredith, Hardy, Scott, and Deacon.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Private Bills were advanced a stage:—

Mr. Hodgins—Respecting the Church of