

There were cases, he said, when a wife might know that it would be unwise to leave anything to her husband, but under this bill the husband could summon the executors to court and have a "washing of the family linen." Similarly a wife could do the same with the will of a husband. He did not think it was a good thing to let the public get the idea that they were trifling with the freedom of persons in the disposition of property.

The Attorney-General pointed out that whatever would be done under this act would be done under the discretion of the court. At the present time a man might, with the aid of his wife, amass a fortune, and then the man might cut out in his will his infant children and his faithful wife (excepting her dower rights), in favor even of another woman.

It was a bill of the same principle as that which applied to the protection of neglected children and deserted wives.

Would Do It Anyway.

Mr. Nickle intervened at this juncture to say that such a man as instanced by the Attorney-General, who wanted to do that sort of thing, "could get round this bill as easily as a dog could jump through tissue paper" by the device of placing his property with trustees. Mr. Raney said a man of that type would not let his property get out of his hands.

The Attorney-General said he was prepared to question the right of a man, beyond a certain limit, in the devolution of his property. The logic of the control of property by dead men could be carried too far. A man who amassed millions owed much to institutions of society, and on his death much of that property ought to go back to the State. If it was paternal legislation, it was paternal legislation that civilized countries had been practising for generations, particularly the last few generations, for the benefit and good of members

of society least able to take care of themselves.

How Act Might Work.

Charles McCrea, Sudbury, in a homely illustration, brought home vividly to the members possible consequences of the act. A man, he said, owned a farm. When he came to face death he decided to make a will. He had a wife, one son whom he trusted fully, and who was of legal age, and several children under 21 years of age. This man decided that the best way to take care of his patrimony and of his family was to leave the farm to his eldest son, the wife being entitled to her dower, and have the other children maintained and brought up by the eldest son as his judgment, of which the father thought highly, would direct. By this act, said Mr. McCrea, one of the minors, wanting maybe to sow a few wild oats, could go to the eldest son and demand a different arrangement, and upset all his plans. If he did not get what he was after he could go to the court. In many such instances, said Mr. McCrea, the last state would be worse than the first. This bill was upsetting the whole general law to apply solely to an exception.

Abrogates Testator's Rights.

Mr. Ferguson said that the bill seemed to interfere with the right of a testator to make what he thought was a proper distribution of his property. He said if the bill was to go through the committee, he would like the individual members of the House to read and consider carefully the effect of the bill on themselves and for themselves. He did not know of a single case where there would be occasion to invoke a bill of this sort. Should they legislate against hypothetical and visionary circumstances?

ASSENT TO MEASURES

LIEUT-GOVERNOR COCKSHUTT ATTENDS SITTING OF LEGISLATURE.

Royal assent was given yesterday in the Legislature to three Government bills: An Act to amend the Agricultural Development Act; an Act to amend the Ontario Farm Loans Act, and an act respecting timber licenses of the Shevlin-Clarke Lumber Company, Limited. Third reading was given the bills early in the afternoon, and at half-past four the Lieutenant-Governor attended the Legislature and gave formal assent.

The last-named of these bills confirms the settlement made by the Government with the Shevlin-Clarke Lumber Company, by which sums that will aggregate eventually from a million and a quarter to a million and a half dollars will come into the Provincial Treasury.

HONORS MEMORY OF SIR JOHN EATON

Legislature Pays Respect to Memory of "Splendid Citizen"

Out of respect for the memory of Sir John Eaton the Ontario Legislature will not meet until 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon, instead of at the usual hour of 3 o'clock. This was decided upon by resolution yesterday by unanimous consent of members of the House.

The suggestion that the mark of respect take this form came from Hon. Thomas Crawford, member for Northwest Toronto, who paid high tribute to the manly qualities of the great merchant prince. J. C. Tolmie, Windsor, speaking for the Liberals, said he heartily endorsed all that had been said by Mr. Crawford.

"I concur in every word that has been said," replied Premier Drury. "Ontario has lost a worthy son and a splendid citizen."

"He was a man who stood pre-eminent in the estimation of the people," said Mr. Crawford of Sir John Eaton. His fame was international. For such a record as his it was only proper that the House should at least in a measure express appreciation.

"The Province of Ontario has lost one of its greatest sons," said Mr. Tolmie. "It is poorer for the passing of the late Sir John Eaton."

Both Mr. Tolmie and Mr. Crawford expressed appreciation particularly for the way Sir John Eaton had treated his employees.