

# ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

## FOURTH PARLIAMENT—SECOND SESSION

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 2.

The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock.

### PETITIONS.

Several petitions were presented.

### REPORTS.

Mr. FRASER presented the first report of the Committee on Private Bills.

### FIRST READINGS.

Mr. Ross—A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Mr. Cascaden—A Bill for an Act to amend the Acts respecting investments in tile drainage debentures.

Mr. Bell—A Bill for an Act to amend the Public and Separate School Act.

### VOTERS' LISTS.

In reply to Mr. Baxter,

Mr. HARDY said that the Government had no intention to amend the Voters' Lists Act so that persons should be compelled to go before the Court of Revision before going before the County Judge. There was no reason why persons should not be at liberty to go direct before the County Judge.

### DIVISION COURTS.

Mr. ROSS moved for an order of the House for a return of the number of cases entered for trial in the several Division Courts in the Province from the 5th March to 31st December, 1880, giving for each county or city the number between \$20 and \$60, between \$60 and \$100, and between \$100 and \$200; the amount of jury fees paid by Division Court Clerks to County or City Treasurers for suits so entered, and amounts paid to jurors in Division Courts for the same period.

Mr. HARDY said that he had no objection to the motion, but hon. gentlemen must remember that such information could not be brought down hurriedly, as it involved a very heavy correspondence.

Mr. ROSS agreed to have the motion include only those items not appearing in the annual report of the Inspector of Division Courts.

The motion as amended was carried.

### RAILWAY AID.

Mr. HUNTER moved for an Order of the House for a return showing:—

(1) The total number of miles of railway constructed in this Province up to 1st July, 1867.

(2) The number of miles of railway completed during each year from the 1st July, 1867, to 1st January, 1881.

(3) The names of the Railway Companies which have received Provincial aid; the number of miles aided; whether out of the "Railway Fund," "Railway Subsidy Fund," or "Railway Land Subsidy Fund;" showing the amount per mile, and the year in which said subsidies were respectively voted.

(4) The names of all Railway Companies to whom subsidies have been voted who have forfeited the same, showing the amounts forfeited.

(5) The total amount granted by this House to aid in the construction of railways from the "Railway Fund," the "Railway Subsidy Fund," the "Railway Land Subsidy Fund," with dates of payments of said grants.

He said that the railway policy of a Government was a very important matter, and one which had caused more trouble to Governments than any other question he knew of. He moved for the return because he wished the people to arrive at a proper conclusion with regard to the disposition of these funds. While there were those who believed they had enough railways, and who thought no more money should be expended on railways, he was not of that opinion. There were sections of country he could name, where the people had voted large sums of money in bonuses, which were entirely destitute of railways, and great injustice would be done to these sections if these railways were not constructed. He thought the Canadian people were behind the times in the matter of railways, and he hoped the Government would adopt a liberal railway aid policy.

Mr. SINCLAIR, in seconding the motion, said he wished to add to it all moneys voted for railways which were not yet confirmed by statute, and also all the roads to which money had been granted, but which had not yet received it. He thought they needed more railways, and that the revenues of the country should be expended with a view of increasing the number. It was not a good policy in his opinion to stint the country of railways in order to accumulate a surplus. The necessities of the Province required more railways, and it was the duty of the Government, in justice to the country, to grant aid to them.

Mr. DEROCHE agreed with the remarks of the previous speaker. The original object of the Railway Aid Fund was to aid colonization roads, roads which tended greatly to develop the mineral and timber resources of the country, adding thereby to the revenue of the Province. There were many sections of country yet to be developed by railway aid. These remarks applied particularly to the country north of the Bay of Quinte counties. He hoped the House would unanimously urge upon the Government the claims of the country for a liberal railway aid policy. Such a policy would convince the people of the reality of the surplus.

Mr. HAY was not so confident that the result of railway aid had not over stimulated certain portions of the country and done but little good. He concurred, however, that the railway policy generally had been a good one.

The policy of the Government had been to help those municipalities which helped themselves, and when these municipalities granted money to railways it was with the expectation that that House would grant the promised aid. They had put these municipalities in a difficulty, and they owed a liberal response to the people whom they had encouraged to vote railway bonuses. He did not think that they could go on much further with railway aid, but he hoped that they would, in justice, aid those municipalities which, acting under the encouragement of the House, had incur-

red heavy railway liabilities.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN said no company was justified in expecting aid from the Government before their petition had been received and considered by that House. The plan adopted by some company's had been to rush into railway enterprises and then come begging the House to relieve them of their difficulties. His county had never received any portion of the surplus. He would not support any further aid to railways, and he hoped the House would not rescind the resolution stopping aid to railways passed last session.

Mr. WATERS said the motion was a very important one, and the return would probably be very exhaustive. The revenues of the country were very elastic, and the Treasury had not been depleted by railway expenditure. He thought, however, that the Government had expended enough money on railways. There was a necessity to keep a cash surplus on hand for the maintenance of their ever-increasing charitable institutions and asylums. If the Government could not support these the burden would be thrown on the municipalities.

Mr. HUNTER reiterated his arguments in favour of his position, and held that the progress of nations largely depended upon their railways.

Mr. CREIGHTON would like to see the grants to railways continued, and thus convince the people of the existence of a surplus.

Mr. ROSEVEAR thought the money expended for railways had done good, and hoped the Government would continue to have a railway aid policy.

Mr. MURRAY said that money had been voted for railways by different municipalities in the expectation that the Government would aid them. He did not think that the Government was going to cease granting aid to railways. Speaking of the proposed extension of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, he claimed that money so expended would be spent in the interests of Ontario; and he thought that the people would endorse the action of the Government in granting aid to roads of such a character.

Mr. ROSS thought that the hon. gentlemen who had spoken in favour of granting aid to railways were interested in some of the railways. He hoped the House would not sanction the opening up of this question again.

Mr. SINCLAIR proposed to include in the return asked for, the length of each road, the cost per mile, and the total amount of aid.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved the adjournment of the debate. Carried.

### SELECTION OF JURORS.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Municipal Act relating to the selection of jurors.

The motion was carried and referred to a Select Committee.

### THE REGISTRY ACT.

Mr. HARCOURT moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Registry Act so that it shall not be necessary in a discharge of a mortgage given by a married woman for her husband to execute the same.

### CHANCERY JUDGMENTS.

Mr. BELL moved for a return of all cases heard in the Court of Chancery previous to the 1st November last, and standing for judgment.

The motion was carried.

### QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

Mr. MONK moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario on the subject of the appointment of Queen's Counsel since 1st January, 1879.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that there was no such correspondence, and the motion was withdrawn.

### THE ASSESSMENT ACT.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Assessment Act. He explained that the object of the Bill was to do away with the exemption of personal property to the extent of \$100.

Mr. MOWAT had doubts of the propriety of such a measure, but he had no objection to its reference to a Select Committee.

The motion was carried, and referred to a committee.

### REPORT.

Mr. FRASER presented the annual report relative to University College.

### THE BOUNDARY AWABD.

Mr. MORRIS asked when the returns he had asked for with regard to the correspondence respecting the arbitration would be brought down.

Mr. MOWAT said it would not be long.

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. MERRICK asked the Treasurer when the Public Accounts Committee would be called together.

Mr. WOOD replied that the accounts would probably be brought down to-morrow. He saw no reason why the Committee could not meet to-morrow.

The House adjourned at six o'clock.

### NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Lyon—On Tuesday next—That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—"That in granting aid to any railway passing through North-Western Ontario it would best promote the interests of the Province to grant a subsidy to a line extending from Gravenhurst to some point on the proposed Pacific Junction Railway to the town of Sault Ste. Marie on Lake Superior, at which point, through railway connection with Manitoba and the North-West territories, as well as the North-Western States of the neighbouring Union, could be effected within two years.

Mr. Cook—On Monday next—Order of the House for a return of all Bills in chancery and writs of summons issued out of the Superior and County Courts of common law in the Province of Ontario, in the years 1879 and 1880 respectively.

Mr. Bell—On Tuesday next—Bill to amend the Municipal and Assessment Act.

Mr. Robertson (Hastings)—On Friday next—Enquiry of the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands whether it is his intention to grant a patent to the city of Belleville for the lot known as the Hospital Lot.

Mr. Robertson (Hastings)—On Friday next—En-