

THE LEGISLATURE.

A DIVISION OVER THE TORONTO REGISTRY OFFICE.

Nipissing to Have a Member—Government Bills Passed—A Lively Evening Session—Appeals on Prosecutions—Workmen's Compensation Bill—Railway Debentures—Various Notes and Comments.

FEBRUARY 26, 1889.

The House met shortly after three o'clock, and after a few minor petitions Hon. Mr. Fraser presented the report of the Committee on Railways.

The following bills were introduced:—
Mr. Whitney—Respecting the Act of Seduction.

Mr. McMahon—To amend the Municipal Act.

The House then concurred in the third reading of the following bills:—

To amend the Workmen's Compensation Bill.

Respecting certain railway debenture debts of the Township of Somerville.

To amend the Act incorporating the Township of Pelee.

Respecting a certain railway debenture of the united Townships of Luxton, Digby and Longford.

To confirm a conveyance made by the Town of Barrie to her Majesty the Queen.

To enable the trustees under the will of the late Hon. James Morris to sell real estate.

Respecting the Town of Port Arthur.

To consolidate the debt of the Town of Port Arthur.

To consolidate the debt of the Town of Amherstburg.

To enable the City of Ottawa to issue debentures for waterworks purposes.

Respecting the Town of Gravenhurst.

The following Government bills were read a second time:—

To amend the Ontario Shops Regulation Act, 1888—Hon. Mr. Fraser.

To amend the Pharmacy Act—Hon. Mr. Gibson.

Respecting the limited liability of incorporated companies—The Attorney-General.

Respecting oaths under the Manhood Suffrage Act—The Attorney-General.

Regulating certain matters under the Land Titles Act—The Attorney-General.

Respecting registry offices—The Attorney-General.

To give representation in the Legislative Assembly to the District of Nipissing—Hon. Mr. Hardy.

THE REPRESENTATION OF NIPISSING.

In urging his bill for giving a member to the District of Nipissing, Hon. Mr. Hardy described minutely the progress of the territory concerned, and showed conclusively that it was entitled to a representative in the Legislature.

Mr. Creighton, who was leading the Opposition, said he had no objections to urge against Nipissing getting the proposed representative, save the general one that if additional places were to be represented in the Legislature, an arrangement should be made whereby such representation could be secured without increasing the present number of members of the Chamber. On the contrary, he thought the Province would prefer a measure tending to reduce the number of constituencies.

Mr. French said the Government had not been so anxious to give Nipissing representation when some time ago it was proposed to do so by way of adding it to another constituency.

Mr. Clancy said the Government were making the new constituency simply because they were on the eve of an election. He thought the population was insufficient to warrant the bill. The Government depended in this respect on the representations of the recent deputation, and hoped, by acceding to their requests, to gain an additional supporter.

Mr. Murray contended that the population of the district amply justified the measure. As to the political color of the district, he could only say that there was a very strong Conservative element there, perhaps a majority. He congratulated the Government on introducing the bill. It was a measure he had urged upon them for several years. The Government had been willing, when the population was much smaller than at present, to give the district representation by adding it to another constituency, but many prominent

deputies had preferred to wait until the population should warrant them in asking independent representation. That population now existed, and the Government in the present bill was only doing it justice. Mr. Armstrong also expressed his warm approval of the bill, which then passed its third reading.

THE REGISTRY DIVISION.
The Attorney-General moved the second reading of his bill respecting registry offices. He pointed out previously, while the bill was various, amendments in matters relating to the present law, the most important change proposed in it is the making of two separate registry divisions for the City of Toronto, to be called respectively East and West Toronto. The Attorney-General showed that the great majority of the city had rendered the change necessary. The main line of the city in this respect is Bloor's avenue. The registry building on Richmond street west will contain the offices for both divisions, every addition being provided, the present registrar will continue to be in the western division. The bill provides that the present senior

deputy-registrar shall be the abstract clerk for the two divisions, half his salary to be paid by each of the registrars. The Attorney-General pointed out also that the present emoluments of the office are sufficient to furnish reasonable salaries for two officials.

Mr. Creighton condemned in unqualified terms that portion of the bill making two registry divisions of the city, and claimed that there was no earthly reason for the proposed change save that of giving a good place and a good salary to some supporter of the Government. Instead of making two good places for supporters at the expense of the city, the Government, he said, should have cut down the fees of the present official to such a point as would have allowed him a fair salary. He concluded by announcing that though the House would not be divided on the passage of the bill at the present stage, that step would be taken before the bill became law.

Mr. H. E. Clarke also protested strongly against the bill, and claimed that the city treasury would simply be deprived of the salary of the additional official. He was anxious to see how his colleague of the city (Mr. Leys) would vote on this question when it came to a vote. The hon. gentleman also pointed out that in 1858 the Attorney-General had strongly opposed a division of county registry offices, proposed then by Attorney-General John A. Macdonald, and insisted that his action was inconsistent. He argued further that there had been no demand for this proposed change. There had been no public meeting, no request from the City Council, no signs of overburdening, and one might very often visit the office and find the present registrar absent, a proof, to him, that he could not have too much to do.

Hon. Mr. Hardy pointed out that there was no parallel between the case quoted by Mr. H. E. Clarke in which the Attorney-General had opposed the division of county registry offices and the present one. The division of 1858 had been opposed on the ground that it was entirely unnecessary, and could not be argued for on account of any overburdening of officials. But in the present case they had a letter from the registrar urging that he was overburdened with work, and further than that, the report of the inspector of registry offices recommending the course the Government is taking. The Government had ample reason for believing that the plea of the registrar was well based, and that the interests of the city would be served by a division of labor. As a matter of fact the City of Toronto had for a long time not had an efficient registry office, and this bill proposed to make it efficient.

Mr. French took up the cudgels against the bill, and was speaking at six o'clock, when the Speaker left the chair.

THE EVENING SESSION.
THE DEBATE ON THE REGISTRY OFFICE CONTINUED.

Mr. Meredith opposed the division of the Toronto registry office, claiming that the action of the Government was dictated from a sole desire to get patronage and thereby keep themselves in power. He maintained that the new office was created for the purpose of giving an office to a partisan of the Government. The leader of the Opposition spoke with a great deal of enthusiasm over the subject under consideration, and concluded with an amendment to the effect that the bill be read six