

was

#### WITHIN HIS RIGHT

in disallowing the statute. In the first place he objected to the faculty being constituted as a self-governing body. The reason given for this action was that there was no provision for the law faculty being represented on the Senate. Now this was not a reason for making the faculty a self-governing body; it might be a reason for asking legislation by this House, and so far as he was concerned he had not the slightest objection to the Act incorporating the University being amended so as to meet that difficulty. He also objected that the statute assumed to confer upon the faculty of law powers which by law are vested in the Senate, namely, the power to appoint professors, examiners, etc., and the power to regulate the course of study. The Act vested these powers in the Senate, and the Senate had no right to delegate them to any other body. Again, he did not see how the University had power to create a corporation with the right to hold property, etc. Then the Act gave the Government power to order the Western University to affiliate with the University of Toronto; but this statute said that the school should not be affiliated with any other university, except on the written request or with the sanction of the law faculty of the Western University. It was an attempt to enact that, despite the Act of Parliament, the faculty of law

#### MIGHT STILL CONTINUE

to exist, although the Western University were affiliated. These were the grounds upon which he had disallowed the statute. He was willing to assist in obtaining any reasonable amendment to the law which the statute might require, but he thought it would have been negligent on his part to have allowed the statute to become law.

Mr. MEREDITH pointed out that a statute creating a faculty of medicine in exactly the same terms as the present statute had not been disallowed.

Hon. O. MOWAT said it had probably been overlooked by the late Minister of Education, but that did not affect the question of the validity of the present statute. The Senate of the University had no power to assign to another body irrevocably, powers vested in itself.

The motion passed.

#### ROAD COMPANIES.

Mr. HARCOURT moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to amend the Joint Stock Companies Act for the construction or purchase of roads and other works. It relates solely to the calling of special meetings.

The Bill was reported.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN moved the House into Committee on the Bill respecting snow fences. It enables municipal councils to allow persons to occupy six feet of the public highway provided they erect wire fences.

Mr. CLANCY suggested that something should be put in the Act by which the by-law could be repealed, and the land vacated by the occupant.

Hon. C. F. FRASER thought there was not much weight to the objection, as before the by-law could pass all the owners and occupiers affected must petition the Council. He suggested that instead of the provision that no by-law should be in operation unless the road were 66 feet wide, it should be changed so that no highway should be reduced to less than 54 feet by the by-law.

Mr. WATERS considered the Bill from the foundation a bad one. There was no reason given for the Bill except that it enabled councils to give away twelve feet of the road allowance. He contended that the law had all the machinery for the construction of wire fences. It might be said that 54 feet was wide enough, but it was not so in his part of the country.

Mr. MEREDITH contended that the general policy of the Municipal Act was against roads of less than 66 feet wide, and therefore this unlimited power should not be given.

Mr. WILMOT said that Frontenac wanted this Bill or a similar one.

Mr. MERRICK was opposed to the Bill, and moved that the Committee rise.

The motion was lost.

The amendments by Hon. C. F. FRASER limiting the operation of the Act so that the roads would remain at least 54 feet wide, were carried.

The Bill was reported as amended.

#### THE GAME LAWS.

The House in Committee on the Bill to amend the law for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals.

Mr. MERRICK opposed the Bill.

Mr. BALFOUR said there could be no satisfactory approach to the game laws until the Province was divided into districts, as it was clear that one law could not be passed which would be suitable for the whole country. He concluded by moving that the Com-

mittee rise.

Mr. CALDWELL supported the Bill, and said that it was agreed that the Bill now before the House was the best Bill that could be suggested after long and careful consideration, both by the sportsmen of the Province and by the Special Committee.

Mr. CLANCY supported the measure, and thought that members were opposing it for the mere fun of obstruction.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that many of the objections to the Bill were deserving of consideration. He agreed in the suggestion of the member for Essex that a law should be framed to meet the necessities of the different parts of the Province; that there should not be one uniform law for the whole Province. In some places lying close to the United States the law in Ontario was more stringent than in the adjacent parts of the United States. The effect simply was that the Americans got all the game, and those who lived in the country where the

#### MORE STRINGENT LAW

prevailed were placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. WOOD said that his constituents were generally in favour of the Bill, but they pointed out that no one set of regulations would suit the whole Province. He was afraid that the Bill would require a great deal of amendment before it could be made satisfactory, and he must oppose it.

Mr. GRAHAM said that some members had undertaken to make ducks and drakes of this Bill. (Laughter, and cries of "Take down his words.") There were some portions of the Bill to which he objected.

Mr. PRESTON thought that by striking out the section relating to frogs, and one or two others, the Bill would be a very good one.

Mr. BADGEROW said this matter had received due consideration. Bills had been introduced session after session. Deputations of sportsmen had attended the committee, and it would be unfair to them to throw out the Bill. The objections to a uniform law for the Province would apply to the present law as well as to the proposed amendment.

Mr. DENISON also spoke.

The motion that the Committee rise was lost.

After considerable discussion the close period for woodcock was placed at from 1st January to 15th August.

Mr. BALFOUR moved an amendment making the close season for ducks from May 1st to Sept. 1st.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. MERRICK moved that the clause allowing woodduck to be shot between 1st January and 15th August be struck out, so that woodduck would be placed in the same position as other duck.—Carried.

Mr. CREIGHTON moved that the time for hunting hares be from 15th March to 1st Sept. Carried.

Hon. C. F. FRASER moved that the provision as to frogs be struck out, and that the hunting of fowl be allowed for an hour before sunrise and an hour after sunset. The Bill prohibited shooting from sunrise to sunset. Carried.

Mr. BALFOUR moved that the season for hunting fur-bearing animals be extended for a month, so as to extend from 1st May to 1st December; also that the words prohibiting the spearing of muskrat houses be struck out.

Mr. GOULD thought that the destruction of muskrats should be encouraged, as these animals did a great deal of injury.

The amendment was lost.

The clause giving the convicting justice power to order that a part of the fine shall go to the prosecutor, was struck out, and clause 11 in the old Act inserted.

Hon. C. F. FRASER moved that clause 13, sub-section 1, be amended so as to read as follows: No person shall at any time hunt, take or kill, any deer, elk, moose, reindeer, or caribou, for the purpose of exporting the same out of Ontario, and in all cases the onus of proving that any such deer, elk, moose, reindeer or caribou so hunted, taken or killed, is not intended to be exported as aforesaid, shall be upon the person hunting, killing, or taking the same, or in whose possession or custody such deer may be found.

The sub-section prohibiting the killing of deer in a river, or other waters at any time, was struck out.

The Bill was then reported as amended.

#### THROUGH COMMITTEE.

The House in Committee reported the following Bills:—

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton)—Respecting conveyances made by married women.

Mr. Ferris—To amend the Registry Act.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton)—To amend the Act respecting master and servant.

The latter Bill was amended after considerable discussion, so that a contract made outside Ontario shall be voided only against the employer and not against the em-