

THURSDAY, March 6.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRASER presented the report of the Special Committee on Mortgages.

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

Mr. FRASER presented the report of the Municipal Committee on the Bills to amend the Consolidated Municipal Act.

FIRST READINGS.

Mr. HARDY—Bill to amend the Act respecting the supply of gas and water.

Mr. MOWAT—Bill respecting the districts of Algoma and Thunder Bay.

Mr. FRASER—Bill to further amend chapter 95 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada.

PRIVILEGE.

Mr. HARCOURT explained to the House that his name had been omitted in the Dominion list on the motion on the second reading of Mr. Waters' Bill to enable widows and unmarried women to vote at municipal elections. He had voted "yea." (Hear, hear.)

THIRD READINGS.

The following bills were read a third time:—
To incorporate the Cascadilla Railway Company.—Mr. McGhee. To legalize and confirm a certain by-law of the Corporation of the city of Kingston.—Mr. Metcalfe. To confirm certain municipal by-law granting aid to the Canada Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Harcourt. To amend the Charter of Incorporation of the Ontario Methodist Camp Ground Company.—Mr. Gibson (Hamilton). To revive and amend the Act incorporating the Port Stanley, Strathroy, & Port Franks Railway Company.—Mr. Waters. To enable the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Toronto to sell certain lands.—Mr. Fraser.

THE LIQUOR LICENSE LAWS.

Mr. HARDY moved the second reading of his bill to improve the liquor license laws. In explanation he said the Act provided for diminishing the number of saloon licenses. At present License Boards have authority to issue four saloon licenses in towns and ten in cities. It is proposed to limit cities of 15,000 inhabitants to three saloons, under 30,000 not more than five saloons; over that number not more than ten, towns under 6,000 to have none.

Mr. MEREDITH enquired if the Act would come in force this year.

Mr. HARDY replied it would not come in force till next year. He said it would be gratifying to abolish saloon licenses entirely, but in looking at cities like Toronto it was found requisite to have places to furnish accommodation for eating and drinking merely, but it is requisite such places shall provide eating as well as drinking accommodation. Section 4 is taken from the McCarthy Act, with some simplifications. In the hearing and determining of objections to the granting of licenses the Board meetings shall be open to the public, and proceedings shall be conducted somewhat in the manner of an open Court. Sub-section 16 provides if a majority of the qualified Parliamentary electors in any sub-division petition against the granting of a new license, no such license shall be granted. The McCarthy Act provides that the petition shall be signed by three-fifths of the voters, whereas under the present amendment there is to be a majority of the qualified voters. The provision applies also to transfers to new premises. Section 5 provides that where any municipality has passed in the present year a by-law separating liquor licenses from shops the Council of such municipality may postpone its coming into force till the 1st of May, 1885. A clause is to be added prohibiting the issue of shop licenses in 1888 in any municipality, and in the meantime no new shop licenses shall be issued. By section 10 inspectors are compelled to prosecute for a second offence. In relation to appeals from convictions, all of them are to be made direct to the county judge, with provision in some cases to carry it further to the Court of Appeal. In order to facilitate prosecution for violations of the Act, it is proposed to grant the travelling expenses of the inspectors in attending court, many of the inspectors having to travel miles while engaged in that duty. By section 14 husbands, wives, and guardians may give notice to the inspector to forbid the sale of liquor to any person in the habit of drinking intoxicating liquors to excess. No liquor shall be sold to any one apparently under 16 years of age. When any person appears in open Court to be drinking to excess and wasting his means and health the police magistrate has power to forbid tavern-keepers to sell any liquor to such person for one year. Under the Benevolent Societies Act, certain parties had become incorporated as a club for the sole purpose of trafficking in liquor. In Toronto there have been formed one or two such clubs—one by one Bob Berry, merely to evade the law. The present Act provides that no organization under the above-mentioned Act will be entitled to use or sell ardent spirits. He moved the second reading of the bill.

Mr. MEREDITH coincided with the suggestion that the Inspector should be forced to prosecute in a second offence; as far as selling on Sunday was concerned, he suggested that where it was only a question of hours and minutes, he would not have this made obligatory. He was a little surprised that the Dominion proposition had

not been adopted. He remarked that the Opposition would do all possible to make the measure as complete a bill as possible, and concluded by stating the only mistake the temperance party were making was that they failed to recognize sufficiently the rights of those engaged in the trade.

Mr. DRURY called attention to the need for fixing the minimum penalty, which had not been done in some cases. He stated that in some cases magistrates had considerable sympathy with this class of offenders. He also suggested that the penalty for a second offence should be greater than a first.

The bill was then read a second time.

LICENSE DUTIES.

Mr. HARDY moved the second reading of the bill respecting license duties. He stated that about the only addition to the bill, as considered in committee, was a clause providing that in case the Dominion License Commissioners did not provide for the securing of the license fee before the issuance of the license, it should be collected as delinquent taxes were collected.

Mr. ERMATINGER asked if they proposed to allow the persons who took out licenses under the Dominion Act the share coming to this Government as a payment for the Provincial license.

Mr. HARDY said if a person only took out a Provincial license he would only pay one license fee, but if he took out two licenses he would have to pay two fares.

Mr. MEREDITH thought the bill should not be read a second time after what had been said. He could not see why those in the trade should be put in such a position. Nothing was to be gained by it. If by force a man took out his license under the Dominion Law, and that was a void license, why should his business be destroyed? These men should be put in a position to take out licenses under both Governments without undergoing a penalty. He hoped the Government would reconsider the matter with regard to the provisions for the collection of the tax. He did not think this was the right thing. If a tenant omitted to pay for his license, the property of the landlord was liable to be sold. This, he thought, was unfair.

The bill was read a second time.

SECOND FREE GRANT LOCATIONS.

Mr. PARDEE moved the second reading of the bill to enable free grant settlers to obtain further locations. He explained that the object of the Free Grant Act was to settle up the country. These free grants were simply bonuses given to the settler on land. Their object was to facilitate the settlement as much as possible. A great many people going to the older portions of the country would rather buy out some land which had been settled upon. At the present time in the United States a man could not sell out and settle upon another grant of land. The Dominion Act provided for second locations. He was in favour of this move.

Mr. WOOD thought this was a step in the right direction. He thought *bona fide* settlers should have the right to take up second locations, as it was in the interests of the country to have its land settled.

Mr. MORRIS thought they should see that the sale was a *bona fide* one. He knew of cases where parties advanced money to people to settle on lands for the purposes of speculation, and the Government was bound to take precautions against these improper practices. He, however, was glad to know that a homesteader would be able to sell out and go further on to settle again.

Mr. MEREDITH thought everyone in the House should assist the Government to make liberal inducements to settlers. He was sorry that Mr. Pardee had not seen his way clear to be still more liberal to settlers with reference to the timber and free grant lands.

The bill was read a second time.

NOXIOUS WEEDS.

The House went into committee, with Mr. Baxter in the chair, on Mr. Ross' (Huron) bill to prevent the spread of noxious weeds, and of diseases affecting fruit trees.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair. After recess

The House again, in committee, considered Mr. Ross' bill to prevent the spread of noxious weeds. The bill provides for the destruction of certain weeds, and the appointment of an inspector to carry out the provisions of the Act. Considerable discussion took place among the members as to what weeds should be considered noxious, and as to whether the matter should be placed under control of the municipal councils to extend the operations of the Act to any weeds within the Municipality which might be noxious to husbandry or gardening in the municipalities. By amendment it was allowed optional with County and Township Councils to declare any weed noxious they saw fit. County Councils may of themselves appoint inspectors, and shall do so upon petition of 50 ratepayers. Upon notice being given any one on whose place noxious weeds are growing, he must cause them to be cut down within ten days from such notice. The inspector is given power to lay an information against anyone refusing to comply with the Act after the giving of due notice. Persons selling grain for seed knowing it to contain the seeds of noxious weeds, shall be liable to a fine of from \$5 to \$20, being the same amount as the fine for neglecting to cut down noxious weeds. A penalty is also imposed upon persons selling, or offering for sale, the fruit of trees infected with yellows. The bill