

TUESDAY, Feb. 19.

The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock.

#### PETITIONS.

Mr. Morin—Moses Jackson, *at al.*, of Stamford, respecting Canada Southern Railway.

Mr. Morin—Council of Niagara for the same purpose.

Mr. Harcourt—Rev. J. H. Johnson, of Toronto, that bill for union of Methodist Churches may not pass.

Mr. Harcourt—H. E. Bennett, of Sharkford Hall, Somerset, England, that bill to amend the Synod and Rectory Sales Act may not pass.

Mr. Clarke (Toronto)—Tinsmiths' Union, Toronto, that assisted passages to immigrants be abolished.

Mr. Clarke (Toronto)—Labourers' Union, Toronto, to the same effect.

Mr. Ross (Middlesex)—J. B. Cooper *et al.*, of Caradoc, to authorize William Howard to practise medicine.

Mr. Dryden—County Council of Ontario, for extension of franchise to women.

Mr. McCraney—Henry Buller *et al.*, of Howard, for amendments to Drainage Act to place the matter in the hands of arbitrators chosen from farmers.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton)—Mrs. J. A. Cull and others, of Toronto, that women be admitted to the lectures at University College.

Mr. Morris—Tinsmiths' Union, Toronto, for manhood suffrage.

Mr. Balfour—Township of Malden, for aid *re* Canada Southern bonus by-laws.

Mr. Wood—William Thompson *et al.*, for extension of Midland Railway into Free Grant Districts.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PARDEE presented the first report of the Standing Committee on Railways.

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

On motion of Mr. Fraser the name of Mr. Ross (Middlesex) was substituted for that of Mr. Fraser on the Standing Committee on Printing.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Mr. PARDEE—Bill to enable free grant settlers to obtain further locations.

Mr. FERRIS—Bill to amend the Consolidated Municipal Act.

Mr. GIBSON—Bill to amend the Ditches and Water-courses Act.

Mr. WOOD—Bill to amend the Railway Act of Ontario.

#### THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. MOWAT presented the estimates for 1884, which had been sent to the House by the Lieutenant-Governor.

#### THE PRINTING CONTRACT.

Mr. ROSS (Huron) explained to the House that the Government contract for printing had expired on the 31st of December last, and it had become necessary that a new contract be entered into. Tenders were called for with the usual notice. Several tenders were received. They were referred to the Queen's Printer, who reported recommending the acceptance of the lowest tender, that of Mr. Wilson. This tender was accepted, and an arrangement for printing for five years was entered into. The prices in the new contract were much below the former contract, and there would be a great saving. There was no further explanation required, and he moved that the agreement entered into between the Government and Mr. Wilson be ratified.

Mr. CREIGHTON believed that the present contract was more advantageous than the previous one for the Province. The House was well aware that there had been a good deal said about the present contract in the newspapers. He thought there should be a change in the mode of tendering for such work. It had been stated in the newspapers, but he would not vouch for it, that when Mr. Wilson tendered he was not in a position to carry out his contract. It had been found since that the company whose tender was the third from the lowest was doing the work, and it had been suggested there had been collusion between the parties, but he could not make this statement as a fact. He thought each person or company tendering should be required to make a heavy deposit to show that the tender was bona fide.

Mr. MOWAT had not the slightest doubt that Mr. Wilson's tender was a genuine one, and that he was able to carry out the contract. He had made enquiries and he was satisfied that the security was ample. He was satisfied that there was no collusion between Mr. Wilson and the Grip Printing Company. There had been no communication between them. Any arrangements which might have been made between the parties were made subsequent to the acceptance of the contract by Mr. Frank Wilson. He did not know that the Government had suffered from the plan now being adopted.

Mr. MORRIS held that Mr. Wilson was not performing the work. He thought the whole facts were not before the House. He was in favour of the plan of having a sufficient deposit with each tender. He thought the Grip Printing Company should be bound to carry out the contract.

Mr. FRASER explained that the House had nothing to do with the company now doing the work. The Government held ample security.

The work was still being done under the lowest tender. No harm had been done the Province.

Mr. YOUNG was glad that this discussion had come up in the House, as it would only clear up any statements which had been made in the newspapers or otherwise. There was no evidence whatever to show that there had been anything like collusion, and it was not likely that there ever was collusion. The last printing contract had been performed to the satisfaction of the House, and he had no doubt but the present contract would be carried out in the same manner. He showed how the printing contracts had been managed at Ottawa. It was a question to consider whether a deposit should not be required.

Mr. MEREDITH thought there should be a large deposit.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) explained how \$15,000 had been given by one person to another in Ottawa to take the printing contract and pay the deposit as well.

The motion was carried.

#### SECOND READINGS.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Consolidated Municipal Act. He explained that the first two sections of the bill had to do with the mode of settling disputes between municipalities in regard to building bridges over streams between two municipalities in a county or dividing two counties. In the case of a bridge over a stream between two municipalities, either Council could petition the Council of the county for the erection of a bridge, and if they refused to build each Council would appoint arbitrators, the duties of whom would only be to decide upon the necessity and upon the site. After stating the course to be pursued in case of a bridge dividing two counties, he went on to say that the present law was not adequate for the purpose. The third section proposes to deal with drainage undertaken under the Municipal Drainage Act. It had been found that in the case of drainage undertaken in one municipality and extended to another municipality difficulty arose, and it was to obviate this. He also proposed that it should be imperative on all auditors to cancel vouchers and thus make it impossible for them to be presented twice. The bill further provides that the representation for deputy reeves shall be on the basis of 800 qualified voters. This was, however, optional, and he did not think it would be to the advantage of all to follow this rule. In the case of counties where incorporated villages did not prevail very much he thought there would be an advantage in adopting the alternate. In conclusion he did not think that any change would be satisfactory which did not leave the matter optional.

Mr. PHELPS thought the present Act was quite satisfactory. Certainly it was satisfactory to his constituents. He was satisfied with the change.

Mr. FRASER thought that there would be no objection to the bill passing the second reading and being referred to the Municipal Committee. Some of the provisions seem worthy of consideration, although he was not willing to pledge even his own personal support to them. He thought that many of the clauses would require recasting.

Mr. CLANCY objected to taking the power of deciding upon the building of bridges out of the hands of the County Councils and giving it to arbitrators.

Mr. DRURY objected to raising the qualification, because it would increase the difficulty with reference to the representation of county municipalities. He thought it a most extraordinary provision to take out of the hands of the County Councils responsibility and give it to irresponsible parties.

Mr. MEREDITH opposed the taking away of the decision with regard to the erection of bridges from County Councils.

Mr. WATERS contended that the bill did not take away powers from the County Councils and give it to the arbitrators. That the latter did possess now. He contended that now if a County Council absolutely refused to build a bridge a case could be entered in court, and it would there be arbitrated on.

The Bill was read a second time.

#### DITCHES AND WATERCOURSES.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Act respecting ditches and watercourses. Carried.

#### SHORT FORMS OF MORTGAGE.

Mr. WHITE moved the second reading of the bill to amend the Act respecting short forms of mortgages. This he explained was to prevent the accumulation of unnecessary costs, and make certain other changes in the Act. Carried and referred to a special committee.

#### THE ONTARIO DRAINAGE ACT.

Mr. BALFOUR moved the second reading of the Ontario Drainage Act in the same manner in which the Municipal Drainage Act was proposed to be amended. He proposed to increase the number of petitioners required to a petition for the repair of a drain. He proposed that one-fourth of the number concerned should petition before action could be taken.

Mr. FRASER thought there was no reason why the bill should not be referred to the Committee. It proposed that one person would not be able to apply for a mandamus to issue for the repair of the drain when all the others were against such a course. Carried.

#### THE DOG TAX.

Mr. CHISHOLM moved the second reading of