

by water we shall have billions of feet. If then, you suppose the country to be only thinly populated, along with the timber and mines, you have enough local traffic to support a railway. But not only that. The railway contemplated has for its object the reaching of the prairie country, where it will receive in addition the traffic of the Northwest. So far as the settler is concerned, I may state that settlers have been there for 12 to fifteen years, they have large farms and have made many improvements. They have done a great deal more than is necessary to entitle them to their patents. I don't see why the people should not have the patents for their lands at once, and I am glad that the Bill apparently contemplates that. The men who have gone into the country had no railroads

OR MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

between one part of the settlement and another, and the only means of traffic is by the river in the summer. There are a few small boats on the river in the summer time. There are no markets, and the only means the settlers have of paying these boats for bringing in their supplies is by exchanging cordwood which they cut. What was the effect of the dispute as regards the boundary? As soon as the wood was cut a Dominion Government timber inspector, or some such officer, came down and seized the wood, and the wood remains there to-day with the notices of sale affixed. This is one of the difficulties the people have had to contend with, and I think it was time that some measure should be introduced here to give the people relief. (Applause.)

Mr. MEREDITH said to whoever the land was decided to belong, the settlers would have to have their titles, and he thought therefore there was no necessity for waiting for the decision of the courts. He hoped that provision would be made for the rights of the squatters. He remarked that the Provincial Secretary had visited the district in question and promised the people a bridge at Rat Portage.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE said that provision was made in the Bill that where any party was in possession his title would be recognized. Had there been no such provision, the record of the Government's dealings with squatters ought to be a sufficient guarantee.

Mr. MEREDITH said that the provision in the Bill was only permissive.

Hon. JAMES YOUNG thought they should be more liberal to young men than to limit the grant to 80 acres. He hoped that the estimate of the member for West Algoma as to the quantity of good land was correct, and if this were so, the amount of the grant to young men might very well be increased to 160 acres. Young Canadian farmers were the very class whom they wished to encourage to go into that country. In the North-west 160 acres were offered, and he was afraid 80 acres would not be a great inducement.

Hon. A. S. HARDY said it was quite true that he had visited the district mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, and he was then told that the leader of the Opposition had gone over the ground a day or two before. The only promise he had made was that it appeared to be a reasonable bridge, but that the decision must rest with the engineers. He still adhered to that view. He believed, however, that in the eloquent speeches which his hon. friend had made there, he (Mr. Meredith) had been able to be more substantial. He was able to deal with railway questions, not simply colonization roads and bridges. He was able to make promises on behalf of higher powers as to what could be done in the way of railway building. Before he left the county he was able to implement his promises. (Laughter.) The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Conmee) had spoken with much enthusiasm of the land in that district, but he had not gone so far as many persons in that district—actual residents, who spoke

WITH UNBOUNDED ENTHUSIASM

of the quality of the land, and said that it extended to a width of 20 miles. Others who were in a position to know had pronounced it not inferior to the prairie lands in Manitoba and elsewhere. He believed that at no distant day it would prove to be one of the most beautiful districts of the Province.

Mr. MEREDITH said he was not in the confidence of the Government as to that railway.

Mr. WATERS thought it would be impossible to deal too liberally with young men going into the district. They could get no immigrants equal to our own young farmers to clear up these lands.

Mr. CONMEE said that the next time there was an election he hoped the leader of the Opposition would get them another grant for a railway. (Laughter.)

Mr. CREIGHTON said that the Commissioner was inconsistent because he had refused to grant the pine to the settlers in the Muskoka district, while he was going to give it to those in the Rainy River district.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE asked which plan the

hon. gentleman preferred himself? He did not seem to care so long as he could create discomfort among the Muskoka settlers. The fact was that the lands in the district now under discussion were not pine lands. It was also to be remembered that the Rainy River lands were not under license—at least not under such licenses as the Ontario Government recognized. The lands in the Muskoka district were under license before the law was passed, the result was that the licensees were taking all the timber off the lands, and the Government wished to prevent that. Hon. gentlemen sought to make a point against him because he did not show an exact acquaintance with the country. Why, it was not long since the ownership of the country

WAS IN DISPUTE,

and even after the boundary question was settled, the question of the title to the land was raised and it was unreasonable to suppose that the Ontario Government would spend a large sum of money in an exact examination of that country, while another Government was disputing her right to it. There were conflicting statements as to the quantity of good land in the district. Some gentlemen had complained that the Government was giving too small a grant of land to unmarried men. Now, if the head of a family were granted 160 acres, and allowed to purchase another 160 acres, and if his son was allowed the same privilege, there would be a square mile to one family. One of the complaints made in Manitoba was that the grants were too large, that a man and his son would take up a whole mile, and that with this sparse settlement it was impossible

TO HAVE SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Mr. MEREDITH—Have you any information as to the present settlement?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE said that so far nearly all the settlement was in narrow lots along the river. It would require prudence of judgment to settle the matter in a fair and equitable way, having regard to the length of time that parties had settled there.

Mr. DILL said he agreed with the Commissioner of Crown Lands as to the quantity of land that should be granted. As a rule a settler should not clear more than 50 or 60 acres. He hoped the Government would give to settlers in the Parry Sound district the same privileges as to timber that he was giving to the Rainy River settlers.

Mr. CARNEGIE asked whether it was intended to grant licenses in the territory now being opened.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE said that was not the present intention at all events. After some remarks from Messrs. White, Metcalfe, and Broder, the Bill was read a second time.

COMPENSATION TO WORKMEN.

Hon. C. F. FRAZER, in moving the second reading of the Bill to secure compensation to workmen in certain cases, said it was proposed to make considerable changes in the law. He showed that up to 1881 the law in England had precluded a workman from receiving compensation from an employer for injuries received through a fellow-workman. Then the first exception was made to this rule. It had always been the case that where an employer was personally negligent, he was responsible for his workmen. The Bill, in the main, was the same as the English Act, though there were some exceptions. The kernel of the Bill would be found in sections 3, 4, 5. Sub-section three of section 3 states that a workman shall have a right of action where he is injured by reason of the negligence of any person in the service of the employer to whose orders or directions the workman at the time of the injury was bound to conform and did conform, where such injury resulted from his having so conformed. This is subject to the concluding words of the section, which states that the workman shall have the same right of compensation and remedies against the employer as if the workman had not been a workman of, nor in the service of the employer, nor engaged in his work. Then sub-section four, of section three, provides that a workman shall have a right of action when his injuries were by reason of the act or omission of any person in the service of the employer done or made in obedience to the rules or by-laws of the employer, or in obedience to particular instructions given by any person delegated with the authority of the employer in that behalf. This is qualified by sub-section 2 of section 5, which provides that unless the injury resulted from some impropriety or defect in the rules, by-laws, or instructions therein mentioned; provided, that where a rule or by-law has been approved, or has been accepted as a proper rule or by-law, either by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or under and pursuant to any provision on that behalf of any Act of the Legislature of Ontario, or of the Parliament of Canada, it shall not be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be an improper or defective rule or by-law. It would be manifestly unfair to make railway com-