

Mr. HARDY presented a return relating to shorthand reporting in the Superior Courts.

After recess,

#### GUELPH BURIAL GROUND.

Mr. MASSIE moved that the Bill respecting the public burial ground in the town of Guelph be discharged.

The motion was carried.

#### REVISED STATUTES.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to make certain amendments to the Revised Statutes.

On the consideration of clause fifteen, providing that bonds shall not by reason of any preferential claims defeat judgments obtained for working expenses,

Mr. WILLIAMS spoke strongly against adopting this clause if the slightest taint of repudiation was attached to it. Of the large number of railways which had been subsidized in this country only two had been irregular in the payments of claims made against them for working expenses.

Mr. BARR expressed the hope that the Government would not withdraw this section of the Bill.

Mr. MERRICK approved of the policy of the Government respecting the matter under discussion, and he did not think that the operation of the clause would be injurious to bondholders.

Mr. MILLER would not have spoken had not the sentiment of the House touching this matter appeared to have undergone a change; and he proceeded to argue that the roads about which complaints had been made could not continue to work unless they met their running expenses. It was a very important matter to the persons who had provided the supplies; but it was a mere bagatelle to the bondholders.

Mr. BOULTER thought that if the clause was carried into law it would do no injustice to bondholders, for they surely must have expected that the cost of running would have to be met.

Mr. CREIGHTON objected on principle to "omnibus" Bills. Such measures contained legislation on a variety of disconnected subjects which had been pitchforked together.

Mr. BETHUNE had as much sympathy with the farming community as the hon. member, but it would be as well to examine as to the number of railways this clause could affect. It could not affect the Grand Trunk, the Great Western, or the Northern; but it might the Midland, the Toronto, Grey, and Bruce, the Hamilton and North-western, and the Port Dover Railways. He explained the operation of the clause, as enabling those who had claims against a railway to seize all the furniture and the wood along the line.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) asked whether the hon. gentleman intended to say that a lien of half a million of dollars prevented all the property which that lien covered from being seized except by the bondholders.

Mr. BETHUNE replied that such was the law. He was referring to the legislation which had taken place in favour of railway bondholders in the United States, when,

Mr. MILLER wished to know the amount it had cost those bondholders in getting such legislation from the States Legislatures and other representative bodies.

Mr. BETHUNE did not know as to the representative bodies, but one of the bodies in the United States which had given decisions favourable to the bondholders had not the slightest taint of corruption charged against it. He concluded by saying that this clause, if enforced, would be not only prejudicial to the interests of the bondholders, but ultimately to those of the Province generally.

Mr. HARKIN supported the clause of the Bill.

Mr. GIBSON entirely agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bethune), and he warned the House to be very careful as to its legislation, for the English money market was very sensitive.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said that a Railway Bill had already been passed by the House, in which, by the assent of the bondholders, a clause similar to the one under discussion was inserted. An eminent railway financier stated that he was entirely satisfied with the legislation of this House, and was satisfied in the wise leadership of hon. gentlemen opposite. (Hear, hear.) No one who read this clause could believe that it would take from existing bondholders any right or privilege which they now enjoyed. Every railway company which took a charter from this Legislature took it subject to its right to amend the charter at any time. This clause proposed that anyone who sold goods to railway companies should be protected in their claims, and that hereafter payment should be made by railway companies for all goods purchased by them. He thought it was perfectly competent for the House to do so, and he did not believe that the bondholders would suffer. For any railway company to come to this Legislature and ask that the bondholders should hold a lien upon personal property unpaid for, against the claims of workmen and others, was to ask the House to perpetrate a fraud.

Mr. MOWAT believed that some modification might be made in the clause, and therefore asked that it be allowed to stand. Everyone felt that the object of the clause was extremely just; and it was believed that it was unjust that the people of the Province should have no claim upon railway companies for value sold. It was, on the other hand, desirable that there should be no interference by the House with the legal rights of debenture holders, but they possessed no rights which this clause sought to remove or lessen.

The clause was allowed to stand.

Mr. MOWAT submitted an additional clause relating to the Library, which stands for further consideration.

Mr. CROOKS explained the following clauses to be inserted in the Public School Act as sub-sections to section 161:—

(4) Every teacher of a Public School shall be entitled to be paid his salary for the authorized holidays occurring during the period of his engagement with the trustees, and also for the vacations which follow immediately on the expiration of the school term during which he has served, or the term of his agreement with such trustees.

(5) In case of sickness, certified by a medical man, he shall be entitled to his salary during such sickness, for a period at the rate of not exceeding four weeks for the entire year; which period may be increased at the pleasure of the trustees.

He said these clauses were simply to supply an omission in the Public School Act, which had been made by the Secretary of the Revising Commission.

Mr. RICHARDSON said there was a good deal of dissatisfaction in the country about the payment of teachers while absent through sickness.

Mr. CROOKS said he was not assuming to change the law, but to place it in the position in which it was before the statutes were revised.

The clauses were adopted.

Mr. MEREDITH moved the insertion of a section giving persons a right to vote for the election of School Trustees in respect of income as well as for municipal purposes.

Mr. CROOKS said the question involved in the hon. member's motion was one which had not yet been decided by the Legislature, and the hon. gentleman wanted to do what he (Mr. Crooks) had studiously refrained from doing, viz., to make any alteration in the School Law until the people asked for it. The Bill was not for the purpose of amending the School Law.

Mr. MEREDITH thought there was a deliberate intention on the part of the Government under all circumstances to insult income franchise voters.

Mr. FRASER pointed out that the proper time to discuss the hon. member's amendment would be when a measure relating to the School Law was before the House. It was hardly fair for complaints as to the treatment of income franchise