

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

THIRD PARLIAMENT---SECOND SESSION.

(The following is the conclusion of Tuesday's proceedings:)

THE EDUCATION BILL.

After recess,

The House again went into Committee on the Education Bill.

Several amendments suggested by Mr. Crooks were adopted, and the Committee rose and reported.

ASSESSMENT ACT OF 1869.

The House again went into Committee upon Mr. Springer's Bill to amend the Assessment Act of 1869, to which several amendments were made, when the Committee rose and reported.

THE EXEMPTION QUESTION.

Mr. MEREDITH asked if the Government were prepared to bring down a measure in reference to exemptions from taxation.

Mr. MOWAT said the Government did not propose to bring down any measure this session, as it was of too important a character to be dealt with without thorough consideration.

LINE FENCES.

The Bill to amend the Act respecting line fences was passed through the Committee.

DAIRY PRODUCTS.

On the order for considering the Bill to facilitate the formation of joint stock companies for the manufacture of butter, cheese and other dairy products.

Mr. MOWAT pointed out that the Bill gave no advantages not given by the General Act, but on the contrary would inflict inconvenience to those it sought to benefit. It would be useless to pass two Acts on a subject, where one would do. If the order were passed, he would have to move its discharge.

Mr. MEREDITH thought the Bill had several advantages over the Joint Stock Companies' Act in point of cheapness and simplicity.

Mr. BALLANTYNE said he had attended meetings of dairymen at both Ingersoll and Belleville, and could not find that a single dairyman was in favour of the measure. At Belleville they were most strongly opposed to it.

Mr. WILLS said that he thought the Attorney-General had scarcely treated him fairly in allowing the House to go so far with the measure and then calling for the discharge of the order. He (Mr. Wills) found many dairymen in favour of the Bill, and those who opposed it opposed it because it was brought in by an opponent of the Government. He claimed that the General Act involved too much time and expense to be generally serviceable.

Mr. MOWAT said that if a certain number of amendments had been made in Committee, the Act might have been rendered workable; but it was now too late to put it in such a shape as to make it advisable to pass it. He might, after considering the matter, provide for an amendment to the Joint Stock Companies Act by which the expense of forming small companies might be lessened.

Mr. MOWAT, in amendment to the motion, moved the six months' hoist.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried: Yeas, 42; nays, 27.

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Hardy, Hargraff, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McMahon, Massie, Miller, Monk, Mostyn, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Patterson (York), Richardson, Rest, Sexton, Sinclair, Sinker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—42.

NAYS.—Messrs. Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Code, Goutts, Craighton, Deacon, Ferris, Fletcher, Harkin, Kean, Macdougall (Middlesex), McDougall (Simcoe), McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, O'Sullivan, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, Wigle, Wills—27.

THE MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE.

Mr. BETHUNE moved the second reading of the Bill to extend the franchise for municipal purposes in cities and towns. He remarked that real estate was the only basis upon which the municipal franchise was now conferred: the reason probably being the shifting character of personal property. The universal experience of civic governments in the United States had been that it was a great failure, owing to the prevalent corruption. The same thing was, he feared, true to a less

Baxter

Preston

and before the words "or boulder stone" in the amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

Mr. Gibson—On motion to read Bill No. 53, respecting the city of Toronto, a third time, will move an amendment that said Bill be not now read a third time, but that the same be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to strike out the first clause and amendment to the same.