

Gibson (Huron), Creighton, Merrick, Widdifield, Gillies, Rayside, Murray, Wood, Broder, Clancy, Lees, Bishop, Ross (Huron), and the mover, Mr. Drury.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Mr. ROSS—Bill to amend the Act respecting Public, Separate, and High Schools.

Mr. McINTYRE—Bill to amend the Consolidated Municipal Act of 1883.

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

After recess,

The House went into Committee of the Whole, considered, and reported the following private bills:—

Respecting a certain by-law of the town of Trenton.—Mr. Sills. To authorize the Toronto Street Railway Company to issue mortgage debentures, and for other purposes.—Mr. Badgerow. To incorporate the Silver Brook Tramway Company.—Mr. Gibson (Hamilton). Respecting the Lake Simcoe Junction Railway Company.

#### SECOND READINGS.

The following bills were read the second time:—

To incorporate the General Annual Conference of the Free Methodist Church of Ontario in Canada, and for other purposes.—Mr. Badgerow. Respecting the Hamilton & Dundas Street Railway Company.—Mr. Awrey. To incorporate the Toronto, Hamilton, & Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Gould. To empower the municipality of the village of Brockton to make special assessments, and for other purposes.—Mr. Gray. To empower the municipality of the village of Parkdale to make special assessments, and for other purposes.—Mr. Gray. To consolidate the debt of the town of Woodstock.—The Attorney-General. Respecting the union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.—Mr. Morris. To authorize the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario to admit Delos Rogest Davis to practice as a solicitor.—Mr. Balfour.

Mr. CREIGHTON moved for all the correspondence relating to the late printing contract between Hunter, Rosé, & Co. and the Government. He complained that Mr. Chamberlain's award, made over a year ago, had not been brought down to the House.

Mr. ROSS (Huron) said the matter had been referred to Mr. Chamberlain, who found that \$13,828 52 was due to the printers by the Government, and the printers owed the Province \$14,784 44, leaving due to the Province the sum of \$954 32, which had been paid by cheque to the Queen's Printer, and credit given.

Mr. MEREDITH asked for the authority of the Government for the settlement of the claims, and practically paying Hunter, Rose, & Co. the sum of \$13,828 52.

Mr. FRASER said the sum being due for legislative printing the Government had a right to pay the sum out of the appropriation for any year.

Mr. MEREDITH still thought there should have been a payment of the money on the part of the contractors.

Mr. FRASER asked if a suit had been taken against Hunter, Rose, & Co., would they not have had the right of putting in a counter-claim for the sum of their contract.

Mr. MEREDITH said they could and would have failed to establish their case.

Mr. CREIGHTON replied, contending that the contractors had no claim in law. The transaction had been irregular from beginning to end.

Mr. ROSS said the amount was paid in October, 1882. The amount had very likely been paid in the receipts of the Gazette of \$9,99 at that time.

The motion was then carried.

#### ONTARIO DRAINAGE ACT.

Mr. CLANCY moved for a return showing in detail as to each municipality the amount of the original indebtedness of any municipality to the Province under the Ontario Drainage Act; the dates of the rent charges originally payable in respect thereof; the sums paid on account thereof; the arrears for such rent charges, and all correspondence in the matter. He said it was certain that very few works were being constructed under the Drainage Act of 1873. He was certain, however, that these Drainage Acts had done a great deal of good, but he wished to know how the Act had been working.

Mr. ROSS had no objections to the return required.

Mr. FRASER explained that the reason why the works under this Act had ceased was that the appropriation of \$200,000 had been expended. He said the correspondence would be very voluminous.

The matter was allowed to stand for the purpose of seeing how much correspondence there was on the matter.

#### THE DRAINAGE ACT.

Mr. CLANCY moved for a return showing in detail the municipalities which had borrowed from the Province under the Tile Drainage Act, and the Municipal Drainage Act; the date of the loans; the amounts borrowed; the terms of payments of the debentures by the Province; the amounts paid on account for principal and interest, with the dates of payment; the amounts remaining unpaid for principal and interest, shown separately, and the dates when the payments in arrears, respectively, became due. His object in asking for such a return was to see how the fund stood at present.

Mr. ROSS (Huron) objected to such voluminous returns, but he was willing to have it made up if the House was willing, and the motion was carried.

#### INSURANCE REPORTS.

Mr. MORRIS moved for a return showing from the institution of the office the dates at which the reports of the Inspector of Insurance Companies had been laid on the table of the House and the year for which such statement had been prepared, and that a corresponding statement be submitted giving like dates and years, with regard to the similar reports respecting insurance companies made to the Parliament of the Dominion. He complained that these reports were not worth the paper which they cost. He did not attack the officer in charge, but the system. He thought a change should be made with reference to the publication of these returns. The report for 1882 had only been brought down a few days since.

Mr. ROSS (Huron) explained that two reports were brought out by the Insurance Inspector. One was an abstract, and the other a detailed statement. The abstract report was placed in the hands of the insurance companies, and scattered abroad as soon as prepared. The detailed report, however, took a long time in preparation, as the Inspector had to travel over the Province in order to audit the books of the different companies. In 1880, the report was laid on the table the 19th day of the session; in 1881, the 24th day of the session; and 1882-3, on the 8th day of the session. He did not think the detailed report could be issued before the month of July in each year.

Mr. CREIGHTON said the report when ready should be circulated among the persons interested, so that they should be some value. The hon. Treasurer had admitted that the report would be ready by July. All this time this important report had been withheld from the public till the House met. This rule of the House should be altered. This had been a matter of complaint amongst these insurance journals that these reports had come out a year after they had been prepared and after some company had collapsed.

Mr. MORRIS thought they should place this statement in the hands of the people at as early a date as possible.

The motion was carried.

#### OBTAINING FRAUDULENT JUDGMENTS.

Mr. FRENCH moved that in the opinion of this House it is desirable to extend the principles of cap. 118, sec. 1, R.S.O. (which prevents confessions of judgment), to cases where, by collusion with, or other act of a debtor, a creditor procures a fraudulent or speedy judgment to the prejudice of other creditors, and that a committee be appointed to bring in a bill on the subject.

Mr. MOWAT said the matter of the motion was covered by a bill which would be distributed to the House in a day or two. He asked his hon. friend to delay his motion until he saw the bill, which he thought would meet the point raised by him. The subject had had great attention at the hands of the Government. During the past year his attention was called by one or two judges to a provision in the Absconding Debtors' Act bearing on this subject, and it occurred to him a little extension of that would cover the ground.

Mr. MEREDITH said the present system was scandalous, as preferential judgments were obtained every day, and he hoped the Attorney-General's bill would remedy this grievance. It was a matter of credit to the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion to have brought before the House this important question which should have been taken in hand by the Government two or three years ago, as it was a very pressing question with business men.

Mr. FRASER suggested if it was so important a matter how came it his hon. friend had not thought fit to introduce a bill thereon during all this time.

Mr. FRENCH consented to let his motion stand at the request of the Attorney-General.

#### A NEW MEMBER.

Mr. Hardy and Mr. Freeman introduced Mr. G. A. Cook, the newly elected member for South Oxford, who took his seat on the Government side of the House.

#### PORT PERRY MAGISTRATE.

Mr. MEREDITH moved for a return of copies of all correspondences with reference to the removal from the office of Police Magistrate of Port Perry, of Mr. John Nott. He admitted that he did not know the facts leading to the removal, and contended that the reasons for his dismissal had not been communicated to Mr. Nott.

Mr. MOWAT said as far as Mr. Nott was concerned politically there was every reason to retain him, as he was a Reformer all his life, as well as his family. It was important that it should be remembered that a man might be a very good magistrate under the ordinary commission, who was not fit to be a police magistrate. He had amongst other things the power of two magistrates. The first step upon which the dismissal had been based was a communication from Judge Osler calling the Attorney-General's attention to the manner in which certain persons had been committed, and who had been discharged owing to the irregularities. He proceeded to state that it was not correct that Mr. Nott had not been informed of the offence for which he was re-