

the motion, pointed out that the County Court judges were paid by the Dominion Government. They had been for a long time accustomed to receive these fees, and if they were taken away the judges would naturally look for some recompense. He had not yet seen his way to the passage of a measure looking to this result, but it might not be long before he would submit such a measure. Efforts had been made to get the Dominion Government to provide some recompense that these fees might be abolished, but he doubted that the Dominion Government would be likely to effect such a change. If any judges did receive so much as \$1,000 in fees under the Act, it must be those in the counties in which the large cities were situated.

#### MONEY BY-LAWS.

Mr. ROSS, in moving the second reading of his Bill to amend the Municipal Act, explained that last session a Bill was passed relating to the sinking fund and interest of money by-laws. Though it did not come into force until March, the Legislature did not provide for by-laws at that time before the electors, and which would be affected by that Act. He mentioned two by-laws whose validity had been questioned, owing to their having been in this position. The present Bill, therefore, was intended to legalize by-laws which had been voted on in accordance with the municipal law as it stood before the amendments of last session were made.

Mr. MEREDITH thought there could be no difficulty such as that mentioned, because where any Act was repealed all pending proceedings were to be continued under the old law. Unless a strong case were made out he did not think this Act should pass.

Mr. ROSS was not aware of the legal aspect of the case, except what he had been advised as to the expressed doubts of the legality of the by-laws he referred to. He saw no objection to their being declared valid.

Mr. MOWAT was inclined to think that the law did not afford provision for the case mentioned. He asked that the Bill should stand, in order that he might further consider it.

The Bill stood.

#### CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. MOWAT moved the second reading of a Bill for the relief of Co-operative Associations. He repeated the explanation of its provisions which he made on the occasion of its first reading.

Mr. MEREDITH mentioned an instance in which a co-operative association in London took refuge in the clause of the Co-operative Associations Act relating to cash purchases to escape the payment of a debt amounting to \$1,000 which it had contracted with a wholesale merchant. He thought some provision should be made to prevent fraud of that kind.

Mr. MOWAT did not see any other way to effect that than striking out the section altogether, and, as that was the essential feature of these associations, it would render them a complete failure. If a wholesale merchant knew that they must pay cash, it was his own fault if he suffered from giving them credit.

The Bill was read the second time.

#### CORONERS' INQUESTS.

Mr. MOWAT, in moving the second reading of the Bill to make further provisions respecting Coroners' Inquests, explained that according to the existing law inquests were to be confined to cases where, from information received by the coroner, there is reason for believing that the deceased came to his death by other means than through mere accident or mischance, but that provision was somewhat ineffective in the operation of the law. The object of the present Bill was, therefore, to give effect to that provision by requiring coroners to make an affidavit in its terms before holding an inquest. In the less settled districts, however, it might be necessary for coroners to hold inquests without making such a declaration, and this Bill provided that where a County Attorney, or, in the Districts of Muskoka, Parry Sound, Thunder Bay, and Nipissing, a stipendiary magistrate, applied for an in-

quest in writing, the coroner was relieved from making any such affidavit. It was further proposed that a coroner should make a similar declaration with regard to *post mortem* examinations.

Mr. MEREDITH was afraid this affidavit would degenerate into a mere form. There was, however, one provision in this Bill against which he must protest. It provided that any human body found within the limits of a city, town, village, or township should be buried at the expense of the municipality. He had no objection to the hon. gentleman burying his own friends, but he protested against his burying his (Mr. Meredith's) on this side of the House.

Mr. MOWAT—They are buried already. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Mr. MEREDITH said the Bill made provisions for burying, but did not state whether the bodies should be dead or alive. (Laughter.)

The Bill was read the second time.

The House adjourned at 4:10.