

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

FOURTH PARLIAMENT—THIRD SESSION.

(By Our Own Reporters.)

WEDNESDAY, Jan. 25.

The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock.

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:—

By Mr. Awrey.—Of J. L. Halsted *et. al.*, of Grimsby, praying that the Bill to separate the township of Grimsby may not pass.

By Mr. Robertson (Hastings)—Of the Town Council of Trenton, praying that the Bill respecting the abolition of market fees may not pass.

By Mr. Gibson (Huron)—Of the Township Council of Greenock, respecting certain protective clauses in the Act of last session relating to the Toronto, Grey, and Bruce Railway Company.

By Mr. Hay—Of the Town Council of Wingham; also of the Village Council of Teeswater; also of the Township Council of Turnberry, to the same effect.

By Mr. McKim—Of James Allan *et. al.*, of Wellington, praying for certain amendments to the Act regulating the law of evidence.

By Mr. Gibson (Huron)—Of Donald Scott *et. al.*, of Brussels, to the same effect.

THE ADDRESS.

The debate on the Address was resumed on the third paragraph of the Speech.

Mr. BELL began with a defence of the National Policy, which, he maintained, was working to the interests of the country generally. He believed that if the Mackenzie Government had remained in power for another term all industries would have been expelled from the country. Not only had that policy proved a blessing to the mechanic, but to the farmer as well, in the increased price obtained for agricultural produce. He read from market statistics in support of the latter contention. On the boundary question he believed both parties had failed in their duty, and he contended that the Opposition had not changed their position from that taken by them on this question in the past. The Ontario Government had failed to forward to the Dominion Government a copy of the resolutions unanimously passed at the two last sessions, and on them lay the blame quite as much as on the Dominion Government. Nor had they expended any money in the disputed territory, though an appropriation had been made for that purpose. He sustained the position taken by the Attorney-General in declining to submit to a second arbitration, and preferring a reference to the Privy Council. In the latter event he believed Ontario would be awarded all the territory that was contended for. He had no doubt, however, that the Dominion Government had not met the offers that were made for a settlement of the boundary difficulty in a proper spirit. Referring to the Streams Bill, he was highly in accord with the Dominion Government in the course that they had taken. It would have been better if the Government had established their undisputed right to control the proceeds of the Mercer estate before expending it in the way they had done. It would be better to place the new Parliament Buildings on the site of Upper Canada College and remove the College to University Park. The importance of the exemption question was pressing itself upon the attention of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Halton) pointed out the unsatisfactory conditions of settlement in the territory now in dispute between Ontario and Manitoba. Capitalists were seeking an opportunity to invest, yet they were unable to secure a legal title to the land. The timber was being cut, under the sole permission of the Dominion Government and the Syndicate. Ten million feet of timber had been cut, it was said, of an estimated value of \$20,000,000. He thought that the Government might have done more than protest against their exclusion from that territory, and gone in and taken possession. They should have upheld the authority of the magistrates they sent into that territory. He thought that the people settled in that territory would incline towards the protection of Ontario, and if so no power in the Dominion could make them citizens of Manitoba. He could not see any reason why the Dominion Government should not even yet ratify the Award. He concurred regarding the introduction of a measure for the public health indicated in the speech, and hoped with respect to market fees, that the abolition of toll-gates would not be tacked on to the measure. The danger of the diminishing supply of