lent to municipalities. In such cases it was usually looked upon as lost. He called the attention of the House to the many loopholes through which they might escape from this repayment. First of all, the municipalities were not to be consulted in the slightest degree as to the necessity or suitability of the work, or the mode of carrying it on. They were to be charged and burdened with the cost, although they might submit reluctantly to seeing the work commenced, or be actually opposed to it. They were to be charged with the cost, whether the work met their approval or not; or whether it was well done or not. And besides all this, not only the lands thus improved in any locality, but the whole municipality was to be charged with the price, although it received no benefit from the work. Was it possible to conceive a measure more likely to produce dissatisfaction among the municipalities than this? Under the present Act a simple process was adopted. In the first place, the cost was calculated, the benefits were considered, and the expenditure was apportioned between the different proprietors, so that each man knew how much the improvement would cost him. After that, the Municipal Council was called on to vote for the work, and under these circumstances it was prosecuted. But here the Legislature was called on to appropriate money for which they did not know the object—a work was to be accomplished, not through the agency of the municipal authorities, not through the most economical mode, but by the extravagant and unsatisfactory mode which usually accompanied Governmental action in such cases. The municipal officers were placed in the position of tax gatherers. He believed the municipalities should be allowed to carry on such works themselves. They would then be conducted more economically, and the more speedily would abuses in the management be detected and remedied. Except in isolated cases, where the work was beyond the power of the municipalities, this was the true theory. In such isolated cases a municipality could pass a by-law, if satisfied that the work was required, and then they could apply to Government for assistance to carry out the work. That would be the best way to avoid any excuses for a failure to repay the money. They could not object to repaying the money—a very different thing from the measure before the House. The hon. leader of the Government endeavoured to place it on the character of the Government. That proposition was utterly subversive of his opinion of Responsible Government. The measure was not to be based on the character of the Government. Any Government, no matter how bad it might be, so long as it had control of the affairs of the country, had the confidence of the House. (Hear, hear.) He was prepared to give them all the power and influence that they ought constitutionally to have.

Atty.-Gen. MACDONALD — You can't help it. (Laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE said whether he could help it or not, he was willing to do so; but he was not prepared to give them more than they were entitled constitutionally to have. Our rules were founded not on one Government having more confidence than another, but on the supposition that all governments had a certain degree of confidence. The hon. gentlemen opposite asked too much confidence when they asked the House to give them power to contract for works whenever they liked, because, forsooth, they were an economical Government, while they had a block of a monument of their economy in the Governor's residence. (Laughter.) He did not believe the question of economy or extravagance had anything to do with the matter. The question was, what was the rule the House ought to follow? He believed it should be to give as little Government work as possible where local organizations could be found to undertake it. He believed the scheme of the Hon. Atty.-Gen., if carried out, would result in extravagance and bungling on the part of the Government, and in dissatisfaction and repudiation of the loan on the part of the municipalities. (Applause.)

Atty.-Gen. MACDONALD said it was not the intention of the Government to lay out any portion of this money where the districts could afford it themselves. They would give what they believed was needed in order to carry out these works, and the value of the lands would be vastly increased by this measure. In proof of this he would read some statistics with reference to the subject. He found that in the county of Kent the swamps were 45,000 acres, which now were estimated to cost 94c. per acre, but the value of which would be increased to $5 by the proposed works; in Lambton, 20,000 acres, worth now $1 10½c., would be increased in value to $5; in Perth, 14,500, acres worth now, $1 59, estimated value, $4; in Bruce 13,200 acres, worth now $1 32, estimated value, $5; in Simcoe and Victoria, 2,600 acres, worth now, 77c, estimated value, $5; in Carlisle and Russell, 110,000 acres, worth now $1.35, estimated value, $4. The Government would take good care that localities who do not want money would not have it forced upon them. He thought that they would be trusted to do what he had proposed as an experiment, and he thought that as they had acted with all economy, that they could be trusted with $250,000, and next year they would be able to see if the trust was misapplied. Anything that was brought forward by the Government would, he knew, be objected to by the hon. member for South Bruce. (Hear, hear.) It was impossible to say, starting on a new experiment, that some confidence should not be placed in the Government. They would be prepared to make a report to the House and follow out the judgment it might make on their acts. They had given every work to the lowest contractor, and should always do so. There was not $100 extras in any of the Departments; and therefore he did not think that they should be required to meet a series of chancery objections on every scheme they might submit. These were the views he had to express; they could not particularize any more. Gentlemen on the other side knew that the country was in favour of the scheme; but they wished to make a show of opposition feeling in endeavouring to prevent anything that might seem to trench upon the Constitution. The Government had endeavoured to improve the country, and to give to those that might come after a better heritage. He thought that he must be mistaken in his opinion of the House if they did not grant the Government this sum in order to defray necessary improvements.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH said surely the Attorney-General might give them some further information. That gentleman, he remembered, when he was in opposition, had asked in many cases for information of a similar nature. Surely they might be treated with a little less tyranny in these matters by the Government. He did not refuse to trust the Government with this money; but he wished to know something more about the way in which it was to be expended.

Mr. FERGUSON contended that the House had sufficient information at its disposal. The distribution of the money was quite public, and was not yet determined. In his opinion there would be too great a number trying to obtain assistance from this fund. The Government said that they did not intend to enforce it upon any locality, and the House had no right to suppose that they would do so. He thought that the Government had given all the information that could be reasonably expected. He did not know that any gentleman could do more than had been done. How members opposite had been fighting straws in their speeches, and as to copying everything that had been done in England, he thought that they had done very well in Canada, and should be content to do that which was timely and necessary in their own Province without being in such a hurry to copy everything from England. With reference to the Parliament House, he would say that the amount paid was the lowest amount that had ever been paid for a building of that kind—in fact, it was the cheapest house in Toronto. It was a long shot when that was brought forward. The present state of the finances had not been known in other Parliaments in the whole world, and the Government were to be complimented on it.

The House then resumed the resolutions on the motion of the Attorney-General, to be reported to the House to-morrow.

THE COMMON SCHOOL BILL.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON moved the second reading of a Bill "to amend the Common School Acts of Upper Canada (now Ontario.") In doing so he said that he would briefly explain the various alterations which he proposed:—In the first place, they desired to abolish the office of Local Superintendents, substituting in their place, County Superintendents, appointed by the County Councils. Wherever there were, however, more than 60 schools, the County Council would have the option of appointing two Superintendents, and an additional one for every fifty schools over the first hundred. Provision was made for the payment of the Superintendent, the County providing at the rate of $5 a school, and the Government providing $5 also, making $10 for each school. Then, provision is made for the examination of teachers. The qualification of the County Superintendant is to be provided for by the Council of Public Instruction, and no person would be eligible to be a County Superintendent unless he had that qualification. He would mention, since there might be a wrong impression with regard to the position of some gentlemen who hold that office now, that care would be taken in framing those rules so that persons holding the position of County Superintendent, who should have shown themselves capable of discharging the duties of the office would not be removed from office. He thought, however, that there were only some seven or eight County Superintendents at present who would be affected by this. Then an important change had been made in the Bill as to what might be said to be the only compulsory provision so far as the law relating to Common Schools was concerned, and that was the provision requiring the attendance of the children between the age of seven and twelve years to attend summer school. The other matters in the Bill were principally matters of detail. The change in principle is that of which he had spoken, the doing away with local superintendents, and the substitution of county ones, and also this important change with regard to the attendance of children. In order to make these clauses as little objectionable as possible—in order to show that what was called the liberty of the subject was not much entrenched upon here, he would only refer the House to the fact that there should be no unnecessary refinement in connection with this question, and they had already interfered with the liberties of the subject in putting restrictions on taverns and saloons, &c. This was adopted because it was found to be for the public good. It was conceded that all the classes of the people should be educated, and there was no doubt that that was the way to render the other restrictions he had referred to unnecessary. If they educated the people properly, they would do more to the advancement of the morality of the people than by all the restrictive laws they could pass. There were also some changes proposed in the way in which disputes between trustees and teachers were to be settled. The present one of arbitration is found to be more expensive and inconvenient, than a reference of the point of dispute to a constituted tribunal, and, therefore, the Division Courts had been selected in lieu of a reference to arbitration. The present system was not satisfactory, and a decision could be obtained through such a constituted tribunal as the Divisional Courts more speedily and with less expense. With these few observations he would beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOYD agreed with much that had fallen from the hon. member, and should cordially support the principle of the Bill; but he thought some consideration would have to be given to some of the alterations proposed. With regard to the fifth clause, as to the appointing power of County Councils, it had been made a question of mixed prerogative in consequence of the Lieut.-Governor having a determining power over the appointment. It had been used as an argument in favour of this that if the Government contributed to the support of these County Superintendents, they ought to have the power of removing them; but this argument would also apply to teachers. The clause might also operate injuriously to the interests of the County Superintendent, and would place in a certain measure, a ban upon the office. It had been urged that fixing the minimum value of any merchandize or a fixing the minimum value of a day's wage was quite as much the duty of a Government as to fix the minimum salary of a teacher's. The amount might be left to the people. With regard to compulsory education, he knew that it would be an experiment. In many countries of Europe, and in Massachusetts, the principle had been applied with benefit, but he did not think that it would equally apply here. In the scattered districts it was hard to see how it would work with advantage. It might work well in towns and villages, and, he thought, they ought to limit the area over which the proposed compulsory attendance should be the rule. Section 21, he also objected to, for he thought that they should rather give the book to poor parents at half price than make a rise of 50 per cent in the price in consequence of their default. His objections were as to matters of detail, and he did not object to the principles of the proposed Bill, but should offer some amendments in suite.

Mr. WILSON opposed the Bill in *toto*, and hoped it would be dropped.

Mr. CLEMENS said if poor schools were to be established under the old system, he should be decidedly opposed to the clause in the Bill with reference to it, but it was not so. He thought that the County Superintendent exercising control over the towns and cities would be objectionable, and, he thought, that the towns and cities should be distinct. The Bill was too arbitrary in many of its provisions.

Mr. PERRY and Mr. CALVIN rose together, and the former giving way,

Mr. CALVIN said he objected to the whole Bill, and thought that they should not be prepared to adopt every nostrum brought over from the despots of Europe by an official they had sent over.

Mr. PERRY said the present was not the time to bring in amendements but some were needed in order to render the Bill effective. He believed that County Councils had the power of appointing County Superintendents. With regard to the convictions held by Dr. Ryerson he did not think that they were fair exhibitions of the opinions of the people. They might be so in reference to the Grammar Schools, but it was different in the case of the Common Schools. He had a decided objection to the 1st clause. He thought that the people themselves had so advanced in the education of the country that they might very well have the matter in their hands. He also objected to the clause fixing the salary of teachers.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. PERRY resumed the debate, and commented on the various clauses. The 12th clause he thought objectionable, and with reference to the 10th clause, he thought that the matter should be left in the hands of those who now had the control of it. He found from recent returns that the number of Free Schools had rapidly increased, and he thought in that matter they were perfectly safe in leaving people to be the judges of what was best for themselves. He did not think that the people would agree to the whole of the amendments, and would prefer to see the whole matter resolved into one Consolidated Act. The second great point in the Act was to secure greater remuneration to teachers, but he did not believe that the 10th clause would have that effect. They should endeavor to raise the qualifications of teachers, which would provide a remedy of itself so long as Schools were well maintained by the free action of the people; he was not in favor of compulsory education. He did not think that when the Government withdrew their grants, as had been threatened, that the School system of the country would fall, for the people would always pay for the education of their children. (Hear, hear).

Mr. FERRIER also criticised some of the details of the Bill in a favorable spirit.

Mr. BAXTER was not satisfied that the abolishing Local Superintendents and placing County Superintendents in their place would work well; and the sum of $12 for the examination of each school was a great deal too much. Local Superintendents had been abused lately, but he thought that they were quite as well qualified in fulfilling the duties required as those proposed. The clause fixing the salary of teachers also he thought would be prejudicial, and would bring down the character of the teachers. With regard to the compulsory attendance, he thought it would be a dead letter. He thought that the Common School law should be left as it is, since it was working well.

Mr. LAUDER said it was admitted that the present law was popular, but when they found that experienced teachers were of opinion that there were some alterations required, they should not allow the opinion of remote constituencies to weigh upon their decision. He was fully in support of the change from arbitration to the Division Courts for a decision as to points of dispute between trustees and teachers. The people required to be led in this matter. He believed that the grouping system would work better than the town superintendent system now did. He would like to see some of the amendments proposed adopted and they might then have a consolidation of the Acts next session.

Mr. COYNE believed that the question should not be looked at from a party point of view, but with a view to the general welfare. He believed that it would be wise and proper to refer it to a committee of the whole House. Referring to the Conventions that had been held by Dr. Ryerson, he thought that they were not to be considered in the light which the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Perry) seemed to entertain for them. The power conferred upon county Superintendents was not greater than that exercised by them in England or Switzerland, or in the State of New York. They ought to know something about the health of the children, and it was intended that they should have the power of determining the cost of the school houses. In his own county, the general opinion was in favour of the appointment of these County Superintendents, and in many parts of the Province he believed that a change was required in the position of local superintendents. He desired that the position of the teacher should be placed in a better position, but it could not be done by Act of Parliament, and would always rest with the people themselves. He believed that a certain amount of responsibility rested upon every individual member in this question, and consideration should not be given to it from a mere local point of view.

Dr. McGILL said it had been contended that the amendments asked for in the Bill had not been demanded by the people, but while it might be so in some particular places, he was of opinion that the people of Ontario were as a whole in favour of some amendments being made in the Common School Act as now constituted. He believed that the feeling of the majority of the people were in favour of the appointment of County Superintendents. The mode of settling disputes proposed by the Bill was sufficient in his opinion to commend the Bill to the favour of the House; the old system was very expensive and inconvenient, and the proposed reference of these disputes to the decision of the Judges at the Divisional Courts would obviate many of the objections that held against arbitration. With regard to Free Schools, he would decide, if he had the power, that there be no Free Schools, but he would have them all uniform, either free or charging a small fee. He hoped there would be no objection to sending the Bill to a committee.

Hon. Mr. McMURRICH said he had been a School Trustee for many years, and although his experience had been confined to the city of Toronto, yet he believed that the system was a good one for the country. He was happy to say that his views of the School Bills and the opinions of his constituents were similar. He wished to see some amendments made in the proposed Bill, but he would never be a party to voting against it on its second reading. The powers of the County Superintendent needed defining. Whatever was impracticable in the Bills might not be allowed to pass. The addition of 50 per cent was a small point, and he did not think it advisable. The other question was with reference to the compulsory attendance, and although some modification might be required in this matter in the country, he thought that it would operate most beneficially in the city. In the city of Toronto it had been long desired; but it would be necessary to have separate schools for them. They might have small schools for them, and at a certain stage of their education they might be transferred to the other schools. With the few alterations he had referred to, he thought the Bill could not fail to give satisfaction to the country.

Mr. CODE would desire to see a consolidation of the various Acts in reference to education. The various clauses would require to be considered, and if the Bill was put in its several clauses separately, he should vote on them; but if it was put as a whole, he should vote against it.

Mr. McKELLAR said there was very little to be added to what had already been said; but it was right that each member should express an opinion with respect to the Bill. It was to be approached in no party spirit, and was to be considered only on its merits. He should refer to but one or two features of the Bill. He believed that the appointment of County Superintendents was decidedly beneficial, for he thought it would be a great deal easier to find a man who would be able to attend to the whole schools of a county, with credit, than to attend to those of a township merely. They could get a better class of men, for they would be able to make a profession of it. In his own county they had, after some changes, adopted it, and for the past fifteen years it had worked well. He thought the number of schools to be attended to by a Superintendent might be well increased to a higher number than sixty. He was glad to hear from the Provincial Secretary an explanation as to the position of those gentlemen who now held the office of County Superintendents. They were, he understood, to continue to hold their positions, if the County Councils were favourable to their re-election. (Hear, hear.) With regard to compulsory education, they must, of necessity, follow the experience of other countries. He was prepared to give the idea a fair trial, and if it did not succeed it might be altered. There was another thing he would like to see, and that was that the position of the teachers should be improved. He hoped that some inducements would be held out to teachers that they might by success in their art hope to hold the office of Superintendent of their district. He might move an amendment to this effect in Committee, but he would not promise. With a very few amendments, he thought the proposed measure might be made a good Bill. They had a system of education which was, he thought, one of the most successful systems in the world, and which was as perfect as it was possible for any human work to be. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. TEFT also offered some remarks about the details of the Bill. He believed that the memory of Dr. Ryerson would long be honoured by the people of Ontario for the school system which he had brought forward and perfected.

Mr. McCALL having made a few remarks in favour of the Bill,

Mr. RYKERT said he thought that the people were considerably mystified about the law, and he found there were no less than 116 decisions given in their courts which conflicted with decisions already given. In order to remedy this, he thought they should consolidate the law. But he would not oppose amendments which, he believed, would be acceptable to his constituents, because the Act did not propose consolidation. It was unfortunate that the feeling throughout the country should be that the Doctor wished to to thrust his system down people's throats without giving them an opportunity for discussion. The County Superintendents were not at present of the highest class, and he thought that that clause would meet with the favourable consideration of the House. He was not in favour of compulsory education, though he was free to admit that the opinion of his constituents was of an opposite character. As regarded free schools, some gentlemen preferred a Rate Bill, but they had great arguments in favour of them; considerable difference existed with reference to