

Fifth Parliament --- Third Session.

(By Our Own Reporters.)

WEDNESDAY, March 10.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

FIRST READING.

The following Bill was read the first time:—
Mr. Drury—To amend the Municipal Act.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. MORRIS asked when the Commissioner of Public Works would make his statement regarding the Parliament Buildings.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—In a few days.

THIRD READING.

Mr. DILL moved the the third reading of the Bill to incorporate the village of Huntsville. Carried.

ESTATES OF DECEASED PERSONS.

On the third reading of the Bill respecting the estates of deceased persons,

Hon. O. MOWAT moved that the order be discharged and the House go into Committee to make an amendment.

In Committee of the Whole,

Hon. O. MOWAT moved an amendment to the effect that the High Court may appoint the judge of a local Court or the Master as guardian of the estates of infants. Carried.

The Bill was reported.

The amendments were concurred in.

REPORT.

Hon. C. F. FRASER presented the report of the Committee on Bill No. 78.

TORONTO TRUSTS COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE moved for a return showing the amount paid up; the names of the shareholders; the name of President; the arrangement, if any, made under Rule 521 of the Supreme Court, or otherwise, and the amount of money lent to or loaned out by the Toronto General Trusts Company thereunder, stating amounts and rates of interest. Carried.

COSTS OF LAND TITLES ACT.

Mr. WATERS moved for a return, showing what has been the cost to each property-owner, where property has been put under the operation of the Land Titles Act, in the City of Toronto, in the County of York, for the year ending 31st December, 1885. He said a great many people would be surprised to see the amount it would cost.

Hon. O. MOWAT said the information would be found in the returns to be made by the Master of Titles.

Mr. MEREDITH—He wants the total costs including solicitors'.

Hon. O. MOWAT—We have no means of knowing that.

Mr. WATERS then withdrew his motion.

WESTERN UNIVERSITY.

Mr. HARCOURT moved for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that His Honour will, in his capacity as visitor of the Western University of London, Ontario, call upon the Senate of said University to furnish a full and accurate account of the property of the University, and the income received therefrom, in order that the same might be laid before the Legislature, as directed by section 5 of 41 Vic. cap. 70.

Mr. MEREDITH was surprised at the hon. gentleman making his motion without giving some explanation. It was in the province of the Executive to call for the returns, and if this had not been done, this motion should not have been made if it involved any censure on the University. Mr. HARCOURT disclaimed any feeling against any University. While considering himself interested in the University of Toronto, he had no jealousy toward the Western University, and it was strange that the information should not be granted without one word. He had no wish to attack the University, but a real wish to get at the information.

Hon. G. W. ROSS, in reply to Mr. Meredith, said he did not inspire the motion, and the hon. gentleman had a right to ask for the information.

Mr. MEREDITH suggested that the motion was a censure on the Government for not doing what they ought to have done.

Hon. G. W. ROSS pointed out that the Act was entirely permissive, and that this was the regular means of obtaining the information.

THE LICENSE FUND.

Mr. MONK moved for a copy of the report of a Commission appointed in October, 1881, to enquire into matters connected with the license fund in the County of Carleton,

with all applications, if any, by any municipal authorities for the appointment of such Commission. Also, copies of all correspondence respecting the report of such Commission, or the subsequent dealing with the license fund of the County of Carleton in consequence thereof. He pointed out that there had been a deficiency in the license fund of \$251, and the County thought they should not be charged with the cost of the investigation.

Hon. A. S. HARDY said as far back as 1880 a dispute arose between the Township of Nepean and the License Inspector as to whether the amount due had been paid to the township. The Inspector contended that he had paid the money by cheque and an investigation was held. The costs of the investigation were charged against the license fund, and all of those who were entitled to a share of the fund suffered in like ratio. He did not know that any other township had complained.

Mr. MEREDITH—Why were not the costs placed on the License Inspector?

Hon. A. S. HARDY—The Commissioner did not find absolutely that the inspector received the money. The bank could not tell who actually received the money.

Mr. MERRICK contended that banks were not in the habit of doing business in the manner they were stated to have with respect to this cheque. They could always tell who drew the money.

Hon. A. S. HARDY pointed out that the report of the judge showed that in this case, at least, the bank could not tell with certainty who drew the money. As to answering all the communications of the township he thought as long as they made the kind of communications they were doing they would not expect replies. On far more important questions this Government could not get answers from the Dominion Government.

Mr. MEREDITH said the misdoing of the Dominion Government was no excuse for the action of this Government. He contended that the Government were liable for the actions of their officers, and they should have borne the cost. He thought the Council had not been treated with courtesy by the Department.

Hon. O. MOWAT—The hon. gentleman is right. The Dominion Government's misdoing would be no excuse for us, and we will not walk in their footsteps. He said that it was just as reasonable that they should be responsible for all the actions of the sheriffs and registrars, who were also appointed by the Government. It must be remembered that the Government had the interests of the whole Province in their charge, and there was no reason why the people as a whole should be called on to pay the costs.

Hon. A. S. HARDY showed that the letters had been answered promptly, for they wrote to the Department on the 8th June, which was answered on 11th; a letter was written July 25 and July 27th, and letters were also written to the Department on Aug. 6th, 9th, 23rd and Sept. 12th, 13th, 23rd, and 26th.

UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURE.

Mr. BALFOUR moved for a return, giving the names and salaries of the officers of the University of Toronto at the date of the order. Also, the names and salaries of the professors, tutors, fellows, and officers of University College at the same date, specifying in each case the subject taught or the office held, and giving the amount of remuneration for each where more duties than one are discharged by the same person. He did not see why returns should not be made of the expenditure. Carried.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS.

Mr. BALFOUR moved for a return, showing the total number of students in University College at the date of the order. The number of female students at the same date, and also, the number of students attending lectures in each of the following subjects:—Greek, Latin, mathematics, physics, history, ethnology, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, logic, mental and moral science, biology, chemistry, mineralogy, and geology. Carried.

TIMBER SALES.

Mr. MEREDITH moved for a voluminous return regarding the timber sales of October last, including the upset or reserve price placed on all the lots.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE suggested that the information of the upset price should not be given. Otherwise there was no objection to the motion.

Mr. MEREDITH said he saw no reason why it should not be given, as it only applied to the limits disposed of and not to those still on hand. He suggested that the true reason why the information was refused was because the regulations regarding examination and valuation had not been regarded.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE said he had no recollection of this information having been given. It needed no ingenuity to see why this in-