

Mr. Fraser, discussing the question of patronage, said that if the government could give all the patronage at its disposal into the hands of the opposition and get rid of the trouble and anxiety that it entailed it could remain in power as long as it pleased. There was nothing more calculated to give trouble and worry to a government than the exercise of the appointing power. There could be no vacancy for which there were not more than one, sometimes a dozen, and many dozen applicants, and there was a good deal of disappointment among those who were not selected, and among their friends. Strong party friends became lukewarm supporters or active enemies. Though the present system might not be theoretically the best, it was in every way far in advance of that which prevailed in the United States, and for which the motion provided.

Mr. Clancy, while not approving of the elective system, strongly criticised the course of the government in the exercise of the appointive power.

Mr. Godwin said that the officials up in his part of the province were the strongest political workers in support of the government. He favored the transfer of the appointing power from the government to the county councils. The motion was declared to be "lost on a division."

#### NONE HAVE BEEN REFUSED.

Mr. Hiscott, for Mr. McCleary, asked:—Have any Canadians applied for entrance as students in the Agricultural college, Guelph, for the present term and been refused? Have any persons who are not Canadians made similar application and been admitted?

Mr. Dryden replied:—No student has been refused admission to the college for the present term. One resident of the province and one non-resident have been admitted.

Mr. Ryerson got an order for a return showing the number of dismissals, resignations and suspensions of license commissioners and inspectors for the years 1890, 1891, and 1892; copies of all papers and correspondence connected therewith, and instructions to special agents, and names of commissioners and inspectors so dismissed, resigned or suspended, and the causes of such dismissal, resignation or suspension.

#### THE LIABILITY OF FARMERS.

When the house had gone into committee on Mr. Sprague's bill to relieve farmers from liability under the workmen's compensation for injuries act, Mr. Meredith made a strong protest. He said that if the original act was based on a sound doctrine there was no sound reason why any class should be relieved from liability. The object of the bill was simply to cater to a particular vote. Because the number of farm laborers was numerically small, was it just that their interests should not be as carefully guarded as those of their fellow-workmen in the cities? He did not believe that the farmers of the province really wanted any such special favor as this.

Mr. Sprague pointed out that the position of the farmer was exceptional, and that he could not exercise the direct supervision over his men that other employers could.

Mr. Wood (Hastings) said that he was prepared to go back and submit himself to an agricultural constituency after opposing the bill. He did not believe that the farmers wanted to be put in a better position than that occupied by other employers of labor.

Dr. Barr (Dufferin) said that the act had operated oppressively upon farmers, who were placed at the mercy of their men. He favored the exemption of those engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. Fraser confessed that he was not able to find logically that any distinction should be made between the farmer and any other employer of labor. The whole of the agitation for this change arose from the fact that the farming community had been made to believe that it was liable for a great many more things under the act than it actually was. It was the common law that provided the principal restrictions against farmers, and not the statute law, and it was the common law they were complaining of. A government bill was now before the British parliament which did not recognize the doctrine of common employment at all, and which gave every servant the same rights of action against an employer as a stranger would have for injuries sustained.

Mr. Rayside reminded the house that the Patrons of Industry had petitioned for the change provided for by Mr. Sprague's bill. The act had originally been passed because of the manner in which corporations treated their employees. It was not directed against farmers at all.

Sir Oliver Mowat said that for the first time in a great many years he would differ from his colleague, Mr. Fraser. The farmers composed a most important part of the community, and there was no doubt that there was a strong feeling against the application of the act to them. They had made no complaint against the common law at all. Since the farmers had asked to be relieved from the operation of the act the house should not refuse to pass Mr. Sprague's bill.

Mr. Hardy said that Mr. Fraser had not the advantage of having been present when the deputation from the farmers waited upon the government, and presented arguments in favor of relieving them from liability. It was then pointed out that the act was not adapted to the rural districts, but to the industrial centres. He made a strong argument in favor of Mr. Sprague's bill.

Dr. McKay said that the hired man lived with the farmer employing him, and that in case of an accident happening to the man he was taken care of by the employer, and provided with all the medical and other attention required.

Mr. Bishop said that when the act was originally passed he did not understand that it was to apply to any but manufacturers.

The bill was passed through committee.

After recess these bills were passed through committee:—

To amend the act to incorporate the Kingston Street Railway company—Mr. Harty.

Respecting the Toronto & Scarborough Electric Railway, Light & Power company—Mr. Smith (York).

Respecting the Metropolitan Street Railway company—Mr. Gilmour.

To incorporate the Hamilton Radial Electric Street Railway company—Mr. Gibson (Hamilton).

Mr. Monk's bill to reduce the cost of registering a mortgage from \$2 50 to \$1 came up for its second reading. Mr. Fraser said that the proposal was in the interest of the loan companies alone, as these used the old form of mortgage, while outside the short form mortgage was universally used. There was no reason why a special provision should be made to govern the registration of mortgages than of any other instrument.

Mr. Meredith supported the bill, and said there was no ground upon which opposition to it could be justified.

When Mr. Wood (Hastings) and Mr. White had spoken in favor of the proposition a division was taken, resulting in the defeat of the bill by a majority of 20, the vote being 30 yeas to 50 nays.

Mr. Sprague's bill to amend the limited partnership act was read a second time.

Mr. Waters' bill to amend the act respecting the profession of medicine and surgery was withdrawn, as the object has been attained by the compromise that had been arrived at in regard to the bill of Dr. McKay (Oxford). Mr. Reid also withdrew his bill to amend the act for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals, as its provisions are covered by the bill brought in by Mr. Gibson (Hamilton).

Mr. Allan's bill to amend the act respecting police magistrates met with strong opposition from both sides of the house. The object was to enable police magistrates sitting as justices of the peace to receive the fees of a justice of the peace. During the very brief discussion that ensued Mr. Gibson (Hamilton) informed the house that the appointment of Mr. Jelfs as police magistrate of Hamilton was upon the condition that he should withdraw from all practice as a solicitor in the courts. The bill was withdrawn.

Mr. O'Connor's bill to amend the judicature act by authorizing judges to submit questions to a jury in cases of malicious arrest and prosecution and false imprisonment, was read a second time.

Mr. Guthrie's bill to amend the judicature act received its second reading.

Mr. Meredith interrogated the government as to its intention in regard to the proposition made for the decentralization of the courts.

Sir Oliver Mowat replied that he was not prepared to state the policy of the government on the subject. Some of the judges had declared that it was quite impossible with the present strength of the bench to hold courts in London and Ottawa. This was a serious consideration.

Mr. O'Connor moved the second reading of a bill to shorten the public school summer vacation in rural districts. The bill provided that the trustees in any rural school section, by a unanimous vote, might declare that the first term should end on the third Friday in July, and that the second term should begin on the third Monday of August.

Mr. McLenaghan opposed the bill.