

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

FOURTH PARLIAMENT—SECOND SESSION.

THURSDAY, Feb. 24.

The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock.

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:—

Mr. Mahon—Of the Township Council of East Flamboro; Mr. Watterworth—Of the Village Council of Wardsville and the Township Council of Caradoc; Mr. Livingstone—Of the Township Council of Dumfries, praying for the assessment of dividends where the stockholders reside.

Mr. Watterworth—Of the residents of Delaware for free market.

Mr. Livingstone—Of the Township Council of North Dumfries to the same effect.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BAXTER presented the third report of the Committee on Printing, which was received.

RETURNS.

Mr. HARDY presented the following returns:—
Respecting the fines collected at the Central Prison.

Bursar's statement of the cash transactions of the University of Toronto.

Respecting Registrars of Ontario.

FIRST READINGS.

The following Bills were introduced and read a first time:—

Mr. MEREDITH—A Bill to further amend the revised statutes respecting mortgages and sales of personal property.

Mr. GIBSON—A Bill to confirm sales of land made under certain classes of building societies' mortgages.

Mr. PATTERSON—A Bill to amend the Municipal Act.

MARKET FEES.

Mr. WOOD introduced a Bill respecting market fees, and moved the first reading. He desired to give a few reasons why the Government had decided to bring in such a measure. The cities, towns, and villages claimed that, while they erected market buildings and maintained markets in the interest of citizens, the seller derived an equal benefit with the buyer, and that, taking into consideration the expense of maintenance, it was but fair that the seller should pay a small fee. He submitted—and he thought the House and country would admit—that it could not be acknowledged for one moment that the right should be given of taxing the produce of the farm for merely the right to sell—(hear, hear)—and the right of charging fees would have to be placed upon some other ground. He would instance the case of the city of Guelph, because it represented in size, and more than represented in market accommodation, many towns and cities. The receipts there for market fees last year had been \$2,980, and the salaries paid on account of market fees \$500. In Guelph's petition for abolishing market fees it was stated that they had expended for market buildings and purposes \$150,000. He did not charge Guelph with wilfully misleading the House, but he thought that he was within the mark in saying that a very small proportion of that amount was expended for the benefit of the farmer or seller. Coming to the metropolitan city of Toronto, where of all places they might expect the best accommodation, the Toronto Corporation states that they have expended for market buildings the sum of \$220,000. When that expenditure was put in as a plea it was natural to think that ample accommodation would be furnished. What was the fact, however. The St. Lawrence Market afforded accommodation for public halls and for butchers, and merely gave the farmers the right to back up their waggons in the neighbourhood of that building. In that state of affairs it was no wonder that the farmers have applied for some provision in that respect. The wonder was that they had remained quiet so long. His remarks applied also to many other cities, in each of which it would be found that provision has been made for the comfort of the citizen, while the farmer and his children were exposed to the summer sun and the winter storm. An amount varying from \$70,000 to \$100,000 has been paid for the right to back up a waggon in the neighbourhood of some buildings. No wonder the farmers had arisen in their might and demanded what might be called justice and fair play. On behalf of the farmer and seller it was claimed that if corporations had the right to establish markets that the farmer should be allowed to judge whether he would have sufficient accommodation afforded to justify him in going to the market place. That matter should be optional with the seller. It was an arbitrary action on the part of the cities and towns to erect buildings without consulting the farmer as to the proper amount of accommodation, and then say to the farmer, "You shall sell your hay here, your cordwood there, and your commodities some other where, and you shall stay on the market for a certain time, and before dealing with us at all you shall pay a tax to us for doing so." The Government's proposition was that the cities and towns may establish markets and market fees; that if they establish those fees it shall be optional with the farmer or seller whether they shall attend those markets or not; that if free then to compel the farmer to attend the market for a reasonable time before offering his goods elsewhere. There are several cities and towns surrounded by counties owning county roads, and which impose tolls upon them. It was claimed by the urban constituencies that it was unfair that they should be compelled to have their streets open in common for the farmer and citizens outside, with the citizens inside. They contended that they were so surrounded by toll gates that they were beleaguered cities, so to speak, and that a reasonable distance outside of the city or town should be free. There was a time when York county was fully justified in collecting tolls. That time, however, was long past. With the present network of railways the residents of York were the persons who now paid the tolls and paid the men who collected the tolls. He had no hesitation in saying that any county that kept up the system of toll gates was not abreast with the spirit of the times. (Hear, hear.) It was the most expensive way

of maintaining roads, and it would be for the best interests of York for some higher power to step in and abolish her toll-gates. But they did not propose by any act of that House to compel them to take down the toll-gate bars. These remarks applied also to Middlesex and other places. The Government believed there should be some reciprocity, and their proposition was that where cities and towns were surrounded by roads upon which tolls were imposed, that this Act shall not apply to such cities and towns until toll bars were taken down for a reasonable distance around such cities and towns. There were several matters of detail to be settled in Committee. It was the intention of the Government to refer the Bill to a Special Committee representing both sides of the House, and both rural and urban constituencies. The time during which the farmer on a free market shall remain, and as to what was a reasonable distance for the abolishment of the tolls, were questions yet to be considered and decided upon.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read a third time:—

To incorporate the Toronto Baptist College.

To amend the Act to incorporate Knox College.

Respecting the Georgian Bay and Wellington Railway Company.

Respecting the Port Rowan and Lake Shore Railway Company.

To amend the Acts respecting the Trent Valley Railway Company.

Respecting the debenture debt of the county of Simcoe.

To enable the trustees of Bethel congregation of the town of Orangeville to sell certain lands.

Mr. FERRIS asked leave of the House to move the introduction of a Bill to incorporate the Ontario Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

Mr. MEREDITH said the motion was out of order.

Mr. PARDEE said the Government had determined that the motion should be considered by the House during the present session, and if the decision was opposed it would only impose a needless delay.

Mr. MEREDITH said he could not help the delay.

The matter then dropped.

NOTICES OF RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. Hardy moved that the House will to-morrow resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following resolutions relative to tavern and shop licenses:—

1. That it is expedient that the following duties shall hereafter be payable in respect of the licenses following:—

For each beer and wine license in cities...	\$ 50 00
" " " towns...	40 00
" " " other municipalities.....	30 00

For each license (other than a beer and wine license) for a vessel navigating any of the great lakes or the rivers St. Lawrence or Ottawa..... 100 00

For each beer and wine license for any such vessel..... 50 00

For each license (other than a beer or wine license) for a vessel navigating the inland waters of the Province, other than as aforesaid..... 60 00

For each beer and wine license for any such last-mentioned vessel..... 30 00

For every transfer or removal of a license under sections twenty-eight and twenty-nine of this Act, five dollars, and the mileage of the Inspector, as provided by section eighteen of this Act, in addition to all such sums as municipalities may impose under section thirty-two of the Liquor License Act.

2. That it is expedient to provide that sections 6 and 7, of chapter 14, of 41 Victoria, be extended to municipalities, in which a by-law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors under the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, is in force.

3. That the following license duties for licenses issued under and in pursuance of sub-section 4, of section 93, of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, shall hereafter be payable; for each druggists or shop license in townships, \$15; for each druggists or shop license in towns, \$20; for each druggists or shop license in cities, \$30.

4. That all sums received from duties on such druggists or shop licenses and for wholesale licenses, issued in municipalities in which the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, is in force, shall form the license fund of the city, county, or license district respectively in which the said The Canada Temperance Act, 1878, shall be in force, and shall be applied under regulations of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council towards payment of the salary and expenses of the Inspector, and for the expenses of the office of the Board of Commissioners and of officers, and otherwise in carrying the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, into effect, and the residue (if any) on the thirtieth day of June in each year, and at such other times as may be prescribed by the regulations of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, shall be paid to the Treasurer of the Province, to and for the use of the Province.

5. That where the Inspector is required in the case of an application for leave to transfer or remove a license to make an inspection under sections twenty-eight and twenty-nine of this Act, and to travel, in order to make such inspection, a distance of more than three miles from his office or residence, the person making such application for a transfer or removal, shall pay to the Inspector, in addition to all other fees, the sum of ten cents per mile, one way, for his travelling expenses, and the same shall be deposited by the Inspector to the credit of the license fund; but the Inspector may be allowed the same, or so much thereof as is necessary to pay the actual cost of his travelling expenses in order to make such inspection, upon his accounts being rendered and approved in the ordinary manner; this clause shall not apply to city license districts.

The motion carried.
The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that Government orders have precedence of all other business except private bills and notices of motion, on Friday of this week, and have precedence of all business except private bills during the rest of the session.

It was arranged that on Friday next the motion relative to Orange Incorporation should be discussed, and the debate on the Upper Canada Col-