

without the consent of the townships.

Mr. HAY moved that to clause 6 should be added a clause to the effect that the Company should be bound to expend bonuses granted by townships within the limits imposed by the by-laws.

Mr. ROSS said that a very pernicious principle was recognized in the clauses mentioned, which did away with the particular safeguards and guarantees which townships exacted from the Company as conditions upon which they voted bonuses. The doing away with these clauses would set a very bad precedent, under which other Companies might afterwards seek to escape from their obligations.

Mr. HAY said the matter had been very fully discussed in the Railway Committee, and though he was just as anxious to secure the rights of the townships as his hon. friend from West Huron, he thought there was nothing in the clauses that would act against their interests.

Mr. SCOTT said that the Railway Committee had thoroughly discussed the matter, and having had the by-laws of the various townships before them, they were acquainted with their provisions, and considered that the Bill was an expedient one as reported.

Mr. MILLER agreed with the hon. member for West Huron, that the principle was a wrong one, and that the precedent would be very dangerous.

After some further discussion, the Bill was allowed to stand.

The following Bills also passed through Committee:—

To incorporate the Ontario Veterinary Association—Mr. Bethune.

To amend the Act incorporating the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company—Mr. Williams.

Respecting the Grand Junction Railway Company—Mr. Boulter.

Relating to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company—Mr. Williams.

Respecting the Water-Works of the city of Ottawa—Mr. O'Donohue.

The Committee rose and reported. After the Speaker had taken the chair,

THE POINT OF ORDER.

Mr. LAUDER, in regard to the point of order that had been raised last night, quoted from a speech made by Mr. Blake in 1869, when he read a letter in regard to the construction of the London Asylum, charging the Government with mismanagement of the building, and refused to give the name of the writer. Mr. Blake assumed the responsibility of the statements made in the letter, and the Speaker did not forbid the reading of the letter.

Mr. BETHUNE—No objection was taken.

Mr. MOWAT said there was a great difference between a case where no objection was made and where the point was raised. The question that had been raised last night was whether there was a rule of the House forbidding any member reading a letter without giving the name of the writer. Hon. members on both sides of the House had recognized the objections there were to the course, and he contended that it would be most disadvantageous to the House if it were allowed to be made a sink into which anonymous charges made by convicts and ex-convicts might be discharged. He thought last night that his hon. friends the Provincial Secretary and the member for Stormont had considerably the best of the argument, but, on examination, he had not found that there was such a rule as the one for which they contended. (Hear, hear.) The rule appeared to have been at first that no printed matter whatever should be read in this House, afterwards that no newspaper should be read, and finally that no extract should be read unless it was relevant and did not reflect upon anything that had been said or done in this House. He had examined May on the matter, and had found that the usage in the British House of Commons was that letters or extracts therefrom might be read without the House being put in possession of the name of the writer. The rules of the House very often depended upon the usage, and he had found that the usage, even when no objections were taken, had been that letters were read without the names of the writers being given. He had come to the conclusion that, however inadvisable the reading of anonymous letters might be, there was no rule by which the appeal might be sustained.

Mr. MEREDITH congratulated the hon. leader of the Government upon having come to the conclusion that he had come to, and referred to the ineffective arguments used last night by his hon. friend the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. HARDY said that he did not retract any part of the arguments he had used last night, but he had referred then rather to the bad taste that would be shown by such a course than to its infraction of the rules of the House, and had but followed up the point of order taken by the hon. member for Stormont.

Mr. MORRIS was glad that the matter had been settled so satisfactorily. It was his opinion that no member should read any part of a letter unless he was prepared to accept the responsibility for the statements contained therein. He thought that it would be desirable that the rule with regard to appeals should be changed. It would be much better if a Parliamentary appeal were made to the Speaker in the chair, instead of to the House, where party considerations might affect a decision.

Mr. BETHUNE said that after a careful examination of the authorities on the subject he had felt bound to come to the conclusion that no such rule as he had imagined to exist did exist. He thought, however, that it would be well if the rule could be changed. He would consent to the withdrawal of the appeal.

Mr. BELL said that the information contained in the letter he had proposed to read came from neither a convict nor an ex-convict; on the contrary, it had come from as good a Grit as there was on the floor of the House. (Hear, hear.) He was quite prepared to assume the responsibility of the statements made in the letter. As far as his honour was concerned, he was the guardian of it himself, and was quite prepared to keep it as bright as the hon. member who had taunted him last night.

Mr. HARDY had no objection to the hon. gentleman entering into a discussion of the question if he were permitted to reply, but he drew the attention of the Speaker to the fact that his hon. friend was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER said that the hon. member must

confine himself to the question of order.

Mr. MEREDITH asked that the circumstances of the appeal and the objection taken should be entered upon the journals of the House.

BLACK KNOT.

Mr. CREIGHTON moved the second reading of the Bill to prevent the spreading of black knot on plum trees. He briefly explained the provisions of the Bill, which were similar to those of the Canada Thistle Act. The Bill also aimed at the extinction of "yellows" in peach trees.

Mr. ROSS stated that his experience as a fruit-grower had been that black knot was not at all infectious, and thought that it would be inexpedient to pass a Bill of so stringent a character. With regard to the disease of peach trees, it was no doubt desirable that all fruit trees should be kept in a healthy condition, but it was very difficult to distinguish the "yellows" from other affections, which were not so dangerous.

Mr. CURRIE thought the provisions of the Bill were such as to render it advisable that the Bill should be withdrawn. The effects of the Bill were that an unfortunate plum-tree grower might have to submit to his trees being destroyed, and be forced to pay a round sum besides to the overseer who cut down his trees. (Laughter.)

Mr. ROSEVEAR hoped the Bill would be withdrawn, and characterized it as the "most strangest" Bill he had ever seen. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WOOD said the hon. member for North Grey was moving in the direction indicated by the Fruit Growers' Association, and he would support the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs. Wood, Ross, Graham, Deacon, and Creighton.

TILE DRAINAGE.

Mr. WOOD moved, "That this House do to-morrow resolve itself into a Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution relative to the Ontario Tile Drainage Act." Carried.

REGISTRATION OF DEATHS.

Mr. Mowat's Bill respecting the registration of deaths was passed through Committee.

SUPPLY.

The House then went into Committee of Supply, the item under consideration being that of \$67,270 for the maintenance of the Central Prison.

On the item of \$2,000 for the salary of the Superintendent of Industries at the Prison,

Mr. MEREDITH asked if the Superintendent was a practical man, and one capable of occupying the position.

Mr. WOOD replied that the Superintendent was a good business man, and made an excellent manager, although practically unacquainted with the different industries carried on at the Prison. The man who at once understood all about broom-making, brick-making, millinery, shoemaking, and the manufacture of woodenware, etc., did not exist.

Mr. JONG said he understood that the labour of the prison was contracted for by Nelson & Son. That being the case, he did not see why the Government should pay \$2,000 as salary to the superintendent of industry when the contractors received the benefit of his services.

Mr. WOOD, in answer to Mr. Bell, stated that, in reply to advertisements for prison labour, they only had applications for 50 men. The Government have now in contemplation the manufacture of cocoa matting, as an industry that would not interfere in the way of competition with free labour.

The item passed.

The next item taken up was that of \$30,032 14 for the maintenance of the Reformatory at Penetanguishene. It passed without discussion, and the Committee rose.

RETURNS.

Mr. HARDY presented a report of the Inspector of the County Model Schools, and a return of the License Inspectors of the county of Simcoe.

Mr. MOWAT moved the adjournment.

The House adjourned at 10:45.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. McLaws—On Friday—Bill to amend the Municipal Law.