

tradistinction to those of dwellers in towns and cities. If he understood the wishes of those whom he represented here they were not in favour of absolutely doing away with all market fees, but it was certainly unfair that a fee should be paid on every 25 cent article brought to market. Another unmistakable grievance was that a farmer driving through a town or the corner of a town with a load of wheat should be compelled to come to the market and submit to its regulations. He believed the Grangers of Elgin favoured not the abolition, but the readjustment upon a fair basis of the market fees. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. COOK thought that market fees were an imposition upon the farmers. A large revenue was derived from the leasing the butchers' stalls, and all the shelter the farmer received for the fees they paid was a space of ten or twelve feet square in which their wives could sell their butter.

Mr. DRYDEN hoped the Bill would go to the Committee, and that it would be modified there to suit the views expressed by hon. members.

Mr. WATERS took a similar view.

The Bill was read the second time and referred to the Committee on Municipal Amendments.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT.

Mr. LEES moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Assessment Act, explaining its provisions.

Mr. WOOD hoped that the Bill would go before the Committee on Municipal Amendments, as its provisions would require to be carefully considered.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee.

Mr. METCALFE moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Assessment Act. He explained that it was intended to exempt from seizure for taxes those goods which were now exempt from seizure for debt.

Mr. WOOD said that councils now had the power to order that taxes should not be collected from indigents, a power which he believed was exercised very wisely. The effect of the proposed amendment would perhaps be that the taxes of the tenant would be thrown upon the real estate, which would be a great injustice to the landlord.

The motion was lost on a division.

SEIZURE OF LODGERS' GOODS.

Mr. MONK moved the second reading of the Bill to protect the goods of lodgers against distress for rent due to the superior landlord. He explained that it was intended to provide that upon a lodger serving a declaration upon a superior landlord authorized to levy for arrears of rent, setting forth that certain goods distrained were the property of such lodger, the landlord should have no right of seizure, and should a seizure be made, the landlord should be held to be guilty of illegal distress.

The Bill was referred to a Special Committee.

PRIVATE BILL.

The Bill to amend the Act incorporating the Wm. Hall Peterboro' Protestant Poor Trust passed through Committee.

It being 6 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The House went into Committee, and reported the following Bills:—

To incorporate the Saruia and Petrolia Railway Company.

Respecting the construction of a branch of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway to the Village of Tweed.

LONDON JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the London Junction Railway Company.

Mr. MILLER moved "That the Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read this day three months." He stated that some years ago a charter was granted to this Company. Subsequently the charter expired, and a year ago a Bill was introduced for the consideration of the House, having for its object the granting of a renewal of charter. The sense of the House, however,

was found to be so strong against it that it was not pressed during last session, and the matter was allowed to drop. It was felt that the railway mania in the country should be checked, and that it was not advisable in the interest of the country to multiply railway charters to the extent that they had already obtained. It was manifestly improper that a railway should be allowed so close alongside of another already constructed. The city of London was well supplied with railways, and it was largely supplied by the Great Western Railway. The amount of capital invested in the Great Western Railway was no less than \$50,154,000. A great many of the stockholders of this road lived in Great Britain; many of them depended on the income arising from this investment, and yet not one cent of dividend had been received from this road, except a dividend of five-eighths of one per cent. in 1868. The Great Western had contributed largely to the development of the western peninsula of this country. They had intersected the country with branches to accommodate the different sections of the country desiring to be accommodated. The real object of this Bill was to keep the charter alive till business would revive, when they may build the road partly or in whole, and then force the Great Western to buy them out at a profit. It must be well known that this road could not ever be run as an independent road. He hoped that such a large investment as had been placed in the Great Western would have fair play at the hands of the Legislature. If they were ever to have a proper railway system in this country, and have their railway bonds stand as high as they should in the English market, they must discontinue the practice of giving charters to every railway scheme that started up.

Mr. CASCADEN seconded the amendment. He remarked that the city of London had never petitioned for this railway, nor had the town of St. Thomas. The whole demand for the road came from small municipalities near London, which hoped to have the terminus, and from the small band of speculators who were promoting the scheme. The existing roads furnished abundant accommodation for the section of country interested, and why then should they multiply new schemes and initiate ruinous competition. Under Great Western management the city of London and the town of St. Thomas were getting a yearly rental from the London and Port Stanley road, whereas before it had come into the hands of that Company they had not realized one dollar of dividend. He denied the statement made by the gentlemen promoting the road that rates on the London and Port Stanley under its new management were excessive, and said he could produce indubitable proof that the rates were no higher now than before. If this London Junction scheme were gone on with, it would shut out the possibility of getting municipal aid to the extension of the Credit Valley Railway from a large section of country, and that road was one in which the whole of Western Ontario was interested. The Great Western had been running the line between London and Port Stanley at a great loss, and he would like to know why the House should administer another blow to that corporation, in which so much capital was invested.

Mr. MEREDITH said he was in favour of this road because it was in the interests not only of the city of London but of the whole western section of the Province. He objected very strongly to the button-holing and lobbying which hon. members had undergone during the last few weeks at the hands of the deputation from St. Thomas, and of the gentlemen who were promoting the interests of the Great Western Railway. He asked hon. gentlemen to approach this question upon its merits, and not allow themselves to be influenced by considerations which might have been urged upon them by outside parties. Dr. Wilson, the late member for East Elgin, who had been lobbying hon. members against this Bill, had in 1872 taken an entirely different ground when it was proposed to build a branch of the Canada Southern to London, for he had gone strongly in favour of that scheme, and had opposed the London and Port Stanley; and he had taken this same

Cascaden

Feb 18