

BILLS AFFECTING MINING INTERESTS.

Taxes on Acreage and on Profits Above \$10,000.

CHILD LABOR PROBLEMS.

Mr. Preston of Brantford Delivers Thoughtful Address.

Government Meets Him by Appointing a Committee to Look Into the Matter—Mr. Gamey's Objection to an Editorial in The Kingston Whig—Proceedings in Legislature.

The session of the Legislature yesterday was marked by several features of interest and importance. Premier Whitney made a statement, published elsewhere in this issue, in regard to companies seeking charters from the Dominion so as to get away from Ontario jurisdiction. Hon. Frank Cochrane, Minister of Lands and Mines, introduced three bills relating to mining: one providing for taxation on acreage and profits, another for the encouragement of refining and smelting of ores in the Province, and the third for the clearing up of all obscurities in the present general mines act. Mr. Preston (Brant) spoke on the question of child labor, and was promptly met with a sympathetic resolution by Hon. Mr. Monteith, the effect of which was to appoint a committee to go into the matter actively and seriously, and to report with a view to the subsequent enactment of legislation in accordance with the recommendations made.

An incident of the session was Mr. Gamey's speech on a question of privilege, in which he objected to an editorial in The British Whig, Mr. Pense's newspaper, published in Kingston. The member for Manitoulin spoke somewhat heatedly. Mr. Pense replied in a very moderate and gentlemanly tone, explaining that the editorial in question was written and published without his knowledge, as a separate staff conducted the paper when he was away.

The Mining Tax.

Hon. Mr. Cochrane's measure "to supplement the revenues of the Crown" is the bill previously referred to in The Globe, which places an acreage tax on all mining lands in unorganized territories. It also puts a tax on the yearly profits of working mines, whether in unorganized or organized territories. This tax will not be imposed on profits up to \$10,000. A large portion of the proceeds of this taxation will be devoted to bonuses for the encouragement of smelting and refining of metals in this Province. No figures are given in the taxation bill; these will be brought in by resolution in the usual form when the bill is being discussed in the House.

To Encourage Smelting.

The bill to encourage the refining of metals in Ontario empowers the Provincial Treasurer, under regulations which may be made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council from time to time, to pay bounties on metals or compounds when refined in Ontario from ore mined in the Province. The bounties fixed in the bill are:—

On refined metallic nickel or refined oxide of nickel, six cents per pound on the free metallic or on the nickel con-

tained in the nickel oxide; nickel receiving a bounty in one form is not to receive it in any other form. This stipulation applies to all the other bounties hereafter mentioned. The aggregate of this bounty in any one year is not to exceed \$60,000.

On refined metallic cobalt or on refined oxide of cobalt, six cents per pound on the free metallic cobalt or on the cobalt contained in the oxide of cobalt. The aggregate of this bounty is not to exceed \$30,000 a year.

On refined metallic copper or on refined sulphate of copper, one and one-half cents per pound on the free metallic copper or on the copper contained in the sulphate of copper, or on any copper product carrying at least 95 per cent. of metallic copper, one-half cent per pound. This bounty is not to exceed \$60,000 a year.

On white arsenic, otherwise known as arsenious acid, produced from mispickles ores and not from ores carrying smaltite or niccolite or cobaltite, one-half cent per pound. This bounty is not to exceed \$15,000 a year.

If the aggregate quantity refined of any of the ores mentioned is such that the money set aside for it would not be sufficient to pay the bounties on the basis given, then such sum shall be divided upon a pro rata basis, so that not more than the maximum amount specified in each class shall be paid.

In each case the bounty is payable for a period of five years.

No person, firm or company shall be entitled to any of the bounties unless they have at all times during which the bounty is claimed been "prepared and ready and willing" to smelt, heat and refine similar ores belonging to other persons, firms or companies at rates and on terms and conditions approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or shall have been ready to purchase such ores at rates approved by the same authority as current market rates.

Making the Act Clear.

The third measure, "to amend the mines act of 1906," while somewhat lengthy, contains nothing of a revolutionary character. It simply makes quite clear the meaning of a number of clauses in the act which are liable to be construed in different ways.

Mr. Gamey Disliked Editorial.

Rising to a question of privilege, Mr. Gamey pointed out that the members of the Legislature had been invited by Mr. Pense to visit Kingston with the other legislators to inspect one of the institutions of the Province. On that very day an objectionable article appeared in The Kingston Whig, Mr. Pense's paper. He thought that the day of being on his defence had passed, because for two years he had been prepared to meet those who had been connected with his case. The result of that case was that the former Government had been signally defeated. He did not want to claim the credit for this result, but believed that his case was a factor. If the Liberal party desired to continue this kind of attack—speaking of The Whig's article—he also was prepared to continue the fight. He challenged Mr. Pense to point to one thing wrong in his life—other than his mixing up with the Liberal party. The article complained of stated that the Conservative party had disowned him in this Province. That was false. He was perfectly satisfied with his position in that party to-day. If the School of Mines at Kingston endorsed Mr. Pense's article, then he would not sit there and vote money for that institution. If he were not a member of the House and he had been treated in the way complained of he would take satisfaction out of the skin of the man who was responsible.

Mr. Pense Replies.

Mr. Pense replied that the member for Manitoulin had infringed unnecessarily upon the time of the House. The only point he objected to was that the publication of the article had been deliberate, that he had planned this attack. If there was anything he disliked and that made him uncomfortable it was political controversy. He had never written a line about the

member for Manitoulin; he had never suggested anything to The British Whig concerning him. He trusted that the House would yet have reason to think that he would not offend even the member for Manitoulin, strong fighter as he was. Every man on his paper had his department. One man who wrote the column in which the article had appeared had been with him thirty years, and he had not found it necessary to instruct the departmental heads. If he had known of the existence of that article he would have destroyed the type rather than have let it appear. The placing of papers on the train was intended as a courtesy to the visiting members, and they would not have been distributed had he known of the article. He did not think that even his worst enemies would say that he was mean, and hoped that after to-day they would still believe in him to the end of the chapter.

Mr. Preston on Child Labor.

Mr. Preston, on motion, brought up the question of child labor in the form of a resolution. Speaking to it, he said it was a national creed that must appeal to all who love children. It ought to appeal to all who desired a high standard of citizenship and education. He spoke for the children of the common people. What opposition might be encountered would come from capitalists or families that needed the help of their children. These last should be helped. Opposition might come, too, from ignorant or dissolute parents who might want to live from child labor. The child of to-day, he said, was the citizen of to-morrow. Mr. Preston declared that for twenty years our child labor legislation had stood stagnant. He reviewed the development of such legislation in Great Britain, and displayed marked familiarity with his subject. The conference in London of 1890 had taken an advanced stage, yet Ontario to-day had not made such progress. Great Britain had in recent years lagged behind, while in the United States there was a revival of the question due to widespread agitation. Mr. Preston gave numerous instances for the necessity of protection for Canadian children, many of these having reference to cases in the city of Toronto. The truancy laws were inadequately enforced outside of Toronto. In the Province the truancy law was a dead letter. There was no provision to prevent the employment of children in hotels or places where the moral surroundings were unwholesome. There was no provision to prevent the exploiting of children as contortionists and such similar occupations. More factory inspectors were needed. A boy who left school at fourteen ought to be employed somewhere, and if not might be drifting into bad company. If not employed the law should make him go to school until sixteen years of age. The laws affecting child legislation should be consolidated. The Minister of Education was in sympathy with technical education, and nothing would further his object better than keeping the children longer at school. Mr. Preston maintained that no child under fourteen should be allowed to work in a factory, warehouse, store, hotel, apartment house or place of amusement; that no child between fourteen and sixteen be permitted to work under certain conditions specified unless the child could read fluently and write legibly, and that