

THURSDAY, MARCH 16,

# WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION.

---

Mr. Crawford's Bill Debated in  
the Ontario Legislature  
Yesterday.

---

## IT MEETS DEFEAT.

---

Onerous Upon Employers and  
Injures Workmen.

---

## MR. AULD'S AMENDMENT.

---

**Hon. Mr. Hardy Suggests a Possible Scheme of Compensation to Workmen.**

---

Parliament Buildings, March 15.

Mr. Crawford's bill proposing radical changes in the workmen's compensation act was under discussion in the Legislature to-day. It was taken up at an early hour in the afternoon, and the debate lasted until considerably after midnight, when an amendment by Mr. Auld to the motion for the second reading of the bill was carried by a vote of 46 to 35. Mr. Hardy contributed an important speech to the debate and outlined a possible scheme

by which payment to workmen for injuries might be effected without injustice to any interest. He was careful to say, however, that it was not a suggestion to which the Government was committed or in regard to which they gave a pledge of any sort. The Premier announced the interesting fact that the recommendation to commission Prof. Mavor to investigate the working of the English act during a holiday trip to England had been urged upon the Government.

To-morrow the probability is that the Senate resolution will be moved by Hon. Mr. Hardy.

### Third Readings.

These bills were read a third time:—  
Respecting by-law No. 109 of the Town of Welland—Mr. German.

Respecting the Church of the Holy Trinity, Toronto—Mr. Foy.

To consolidate certain debts of the Town of Simcoe—Mr. Carpenter.

### Sale of Land.

Replying to Mr. Carnegie, Hon. Mr. Gibson stated that lot number three in the ninth concession of Laxton was offered for sale by tender, there being a number of applicants for it. Mr. John Perkins of Norland was the highest tenderer, but he has not paid for the land, and consequently no sale has been carried out.

### Ferry Bill Goes Back.

Mr. Crawford moved the reference back to committee of the City of Toronto's bill regarding the chain ferry. Through a misunderstanding, he said, larger powers were applied for than the city desired. He understood from Mr. Osler, solicitor of the Ferry Company, that there would be no objection to the bill as it would be redrawn.

Mr. Gibson replied that he did not think justice had been done by the press in their criticisms of the action of the Private Bills Committee in regard to the ferry bill. The committee took the ground that the bill as brought before them gave the city power to go into the ferry business in a general way, and they were not prepared to go as far as that. For himself he thought the scheme a meritorious one, and had so expressed himself in committee; but, with others, he desired more definite details in the way of cost, etc., and if the bill was brought in in that shape he did not think there could be any objection to its reconsideration. Mr. Gibson referred to some criticism of the press which would lead one to believe that members of the House were influenced by monopolists. This was not the case. Corporations had their rights as well as private individuals, but they could not have any influence on the actions of the Private Bills or any other committee, or on members of the House.

Mr. Whitney concurred in the condemnation of the practice of charging members of the Legislature with being tools of the corporations. There never was any body of which such a thing could be said with less truth than this Legislature.