

Mr. DRURY said he had no objection, but he did not know that a lawyer knew any more than other people about municipal matters. (Laughter.)

The names of Messrs. Harcourt and White were added and the motion carried.

ACCIDENTS TO WORKMEN ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. MEREDITH moved for a return of judgments or decisions in any Division of the High Court of Justice as to the liability of railway companies for accidents to workmen, where the company has failed to comply with the provisions of the Railway Accidents Act, 1881, and the accidents have happened by reason of such non-compliance. He thought that as great a measure of responsibility as possible should be placed upon the companies.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that the hon. gentleman was quite right in supposing that it was the intention of the framer of the Bill regarding compensation to workmen that the liability of the railways should be as extensive as this Legislature could make it, and that the person injured in any of the ways mentioned in the Bill should have a right of action, not only against a railway company chartered by this Legislature, but against any railway operating in this Province, provided the Legislature had jurisdiction. So far he had not been able to follow the interpretation which the Courts had given of the Acts which affected the liability of the railway companies. But it was intended by the Bill now before the House to endeavour to reach all the railway companies to as great an extent as the jurisdiction of the House would go. He agreed with the leader of the Opposition that if the clauses now in the Bill were not sufficiently severe on that point, it would be well to add such words as would make it conclusive that the intention of the Legislature was to give a right of action wherever possible, and to exercise the legislative authority of the House to the very utmost extent. Motion carried.

WIDTH OF WAGGON TIRES.

Mr. SNIDER moved the second reading of a Bill to regulate the width of tires. The Bill provided that on and after the 1st June, 1890, the width of tires on waggons, drays, etc., carrying a load of 2,000 pounds should be not less than 3½ inches. The Bill was not to apply to counties or districts having unorganized townships within their limits. Enquiries made of manufacturers and others had elicited replies to the effect that waggons with wide tires were coming into use more extensively and were being manufactured in larger numbers than formerly. He believed a great saving would be effected in the repairing of roads if wide tires were generally used. In one village it was estimated that a saving of \$500 a year was effected in this way. The expense of replacing narrow tires by wide tires would be from \$16 to \$20 per waggon, and the Bill gave ample time to make the change.

Mr. HUDSON said that the compulsory broadening of the tire would necessitate the making of wheels much larger than would be necessary to sustain the weight.

Mr. ROBILLARD opposed the Bill, saying that it would be impracticable to enforce such a law.

Mr. LEES said that wide waggon tires were unsuited to some kind of roads. He moved the three months hoist.

Mr. DRURY said that to many parts of the Province the law would be attended with great hardship, while in others it would be of great benefit. He proposed that it should not apply to unorganized districts, and that in other counties it should be permissive, and that the County Councils should regulate the matter.

Mr. SILLS thought that the people should be allowed to regulate the matter for themselves, and that the Bill should be permissive.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that it was evident that a regulation which was just and wise in one district might be altogether out of place in another, and there was therefore force in the suggestion that the Bill should be made permissive. At all events the House, without committing itself to any particular measure, might pass the second reading, and allow the Bill to go to the Municipal Committee.

Mr. LEES withdrew his amendment.

Mr. MEREDITH said that the County Councils already had power to regulate the width of tires of certain vehicles.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Municipal Committee.

DRAINAGE UNDER RAILWAYS.

Mr. WATERS moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Ditches and Watercourses Act. The effect of the Bill was to allow of the waterways along railways being utilized for drainage purposes and to allow persons to enter upon the property of rail-

ways for the purpose of constructing drains. The lack of such legislation was found to be a great inconvenience and obstruction to the drainage of property in the neighbourhood of railways. The Bill also made provision for the case of an engineer refusing to give a certificate under the Ditches and Watercourses Act.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE said that the Municipal Committee in dealing with this Bill would have to take great care that the railway company should have the opportunity of supervising the work in order to see that the safety of the railway and the permanence of the road bed were not affected.

Mr. PHELPS—Have we any control over railways that are under the jurisdiction of the Dominion?

Hon. O. MOWAT—That is a question in which it is impossible to give a positive answer. The principle involved is one upon which there is no decisive judgment. We hope we have jurisdiction, but at present it is impossible to say.

Mr. MEREDITH—Submit it to the Privy Council.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to the Municipal Committee.

THE FRANCHISE.

Mr. BALFOUR moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Franchise Act. The object of the Bill was to give greater facilities to landholders' sons employed as mariners, fishermen, or students to exercise the franchise. It provided that the time spent away from home by these persons in pursuing their occupations should be counted as time spent at home.

Mr. MEREDITH said that if the question of the franchise was to be re-opened the Bill should be amended by providing that residence within the electoral district, instead of within the municipality, should qualify income voters and wage-earners.

Mr. WHITE suggested that the Bill had been copied from the Dominion Franchise Bill, and there ought to be no difficulty in passing it. The Dominion Act was a good Bill.

Hon. A. S. HARDY—Whom is it good for?

Mr. WHITE—Well, fishermen and students at least.

The Bill was read the second time.

The Bill was referred to the Committee on the Bill to extend the hours of polling with the name of Mr. Balfour added.

STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

On the second reading of Mr. Ermatinger's Bill to amend the Municipal Act, he stated that the object of the Bill was that after making an improvement by a frontage tax it should be kept up by this same measure. By this means log rolling would be abolished and the ratepayers would see that their money was well expended. It should only apply to cities and municipalities that passed a by-law for this purpose.

The Bill was read the second time and referred to the Municipal Committee.

LIDLAW TRUST.

The House went into Committee on Hon. C. F. Fraser's Bill to enable the Toronto General Trusts Company as trustees of Anne Laidlaw to purchase lands. The Bill was reported.

VILLAGE OF BEETON.

Mr. DRURY moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the village of Beeton.

Mr. O'CONNOR contended that the most improper means were taken to secure the incorporation of the village. He proceeded to read a portion of the judgment by Chief Justice Wilson, in which he said he could not interfere unless there was gross fraud shown. The judge had characterized the proceedings as irregular and marked by falsehood and utter disregard of the law.

Mr. DRURY showed that the village had over 700 inhabitants, and it was on this point that the Chief Justice had ruled. The judge had advised the village to come here. The Private Bills Committee had had a petition of 87 names from the village, the unanimous petitions of the village, and County Councils in favour of the Bill.

Mr. MEREDITH asked if there was any objection to insert a clause putting the Act into operation only on a vote of the majority of the inhabitants.

Mr. DRURY thought there would be at this stage.

Hon. C. F. FRASER suggested that the only questions were, Should the village be incorporated, and from what time should it date? To these the answer was that the Legislature often incorporated municipalities which had not the proper qualifications.

Mr. BADGEROW supported the Bill.

Mr. PHELPS stated the facts surrounding the incorporation, and showed that on June 5th, 1884, a petition was presented to the County Council for incorporation, which showed that there was the proper number of inhabitants. The by-law was to go into operation only in January, 1885, and yet there was no opposition until the June following. He was satisfied that no harm would be done