

TUESDAY, Jan. 21.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

PETITIONS.

Hon. Mr. Pardee—From J. A. McKenzie and others, for an increased grant to the Fruit Growers' Association.

Hon. Mr. Scott—From J. Roberts and others, for an Act to incorporate the Beechwood Cemetery Company.

Mr. Ardagh—From the Town Council of Collingwood, for an Act to define the limits of the said town.

Also, from Henry McGill and others, of Watt, for the consideration of a road in Muskoka.

Also, from Wm. Foot and others, of Muskoka, for a bridge in the same district.

Mr. Wells—From Louisa Goodhue, for an Act to determine an Act relating to the distribution of the estate of the late Hon. G. J. Goodhue.

Mr. Prince—From Philip Mooney and others, of Sandwich, for the formation of a new township.

Mr. Gifford—From W. Rea and others of Cobourg, relating to hygienic system of education.

Mr. McManus—From the Village Council of Orangeville, for an Act to incorporate the Town of Orangeville, and for other purposes.

Mr. Clarke—From the County Council of Wellington, for an Act to permit the formation of a new county which would dismember Wellington.

Mr. Rykert—From the Town Council of St. Catharines, for an Act to encourage manufactures.

Mr. Prince—From George Jerome and others, for an Act to incorporate the North Shore of Lake Superior Mining Company.

Mr. Bethune—From the Township Council of Wallace, for the County of Perth, for registration purposes.

Mr. Wells—From Mrs. Morrison and others, for the incorporation of the Toronto Opera House Company.

Mr. Barber—From School Board of Streetsville for amendments to the School Act.

Mr. Springer—From School Board of Berlin for certain amendments to the School Act.

Mr. Fitzsimmons—From Walker Bell and others, of Brockville, respecting the establishment of a Normal School at Brockville.

Mr. Williams—From Robt. Bedford and others, of Port Hope, for amendments to the law relating to Hygienic Medication.

Twenty-three petitions were presented with reference to the manufacture of liquor.

PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW.

On reception of petitions,

Mr. RYKERT objected to the reception of petitions praying for a prohibitory liquor law, on the ground that this House had no power to deal with that question. He cited section 91 of Confederation Act.

Mr. PRINCE was satisfied that this House had at least power to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Attorney-General MOWAT supposed the hon. gentleman did not intend to oppose the reception of the petitions, but merely wished to raise the Constitutional point. It was a very important point, and should very properly be discussed. It would be impossible for the Speaker to decide a point like that.

Mr. RYKERT—The Speaker can reserve his decision.

Attorney-General MOWAT said if the Speaker were to decide the point at all it should only be after a full discussion. He had given the subject some consideration, and his present view of the position was that the arguments that this House had the power to deal with this question were stronger than those against that view, but he would not like to commit himself. If the question was to be discussed here, the hon. gentleman had better give notice, so that it could be discussed intelligently.

Mr. SPEAKER said he did not conceive that he was called upon to decide this question now. He saw nothing in the rules to prohibit the reception of the petitions.

Mr. RYKERT submitted that if a Bill could not be passed it was not regular to admit the petitions in favour of it.

The petitions were then received.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Mr. Crooks—To establish a school for practical science.

Also—To establish liens in favour of mechanics, machinists, and others.

Also—To facilitate the adjustment of disputes between masters and workmen.

Mr. Meredith—To amend the Act respecting the conveyance of real estate, and to facilitate the conveyance of real estate to married women.

Mr. H. S. Macdonald—To amend the Act 31st Vic., respecting joint stock companies.

Also—To amend the Tavern and Shop License Act of 1868.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved that on Tuesday next the House go into Committee on Ways and Means. Carried.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CROOKS the report of the Committee of Supply was adopted.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the University of Toronto. In doing so he explained the advantages which would result from legislation in this respect, but his observations could not be distinctly heard in the gallery. He referred to the alteration of the government of the London University, which in 1849 was placed under the government of a Chancellor, Senate, and Convocation. That Convocation was vested with very large powers, which went to the extent of determining what persons should or should not receive degrees, of making statutes, and of governing by means of statutes, and other powers. In 1853 it was thought desirable by the Administration of Sir Francis Hincks that the constitution of the University of Toronto should be altered to the system prevailing in England, in connection with the University of London. This the hon. gentleman explained was done, and went on to describe other powers possessed by the London University. In 1858 the London University received a new charter, and one of the prominent provisions of that charter was the establishment of a convocation consisting of those who had received degrees and were of certain standing in the University. The Senate still continued to be the governing body and possessed functions of legislation and government. The Convocation, in addition to the other powers with which it was vested, possessed the power of making nominees, from which the Crown selected members of the Senate. The Bill presented to the House would adopt the modifications which had taken place in the constitution of the University of London. In the preamble of the Bill it was stated that it was desirable to establish in this Province a university of similar constitution to that of the University of London, and many advantages, he thought, would be derived by such a change. After alluding to the legislation which took place in 1832 and 1846, in connection with Scottish Universities, the hon. gentleman said another feature of the Bill was that the powers of universities were enlarged in reference to the subjects of study. It could not be said that the University of Toronto had been behind-hand in meeting the requirements of the day. The curriculum had been enlarged to the fullest extent capable under the constitution. The courses for physical science and modern languages had not been neglected. In the new charter to the University of London a power for the conferring of degrees was given, and this power was asked for for the University of Toronto. As regards the constitution of the Senate, the Senate of the University of Toronto was an honorary body, a body consisting of nominees of the Crown and some ex-officio members. It had not been found to meet all the requirements of the University. The members of that body were appointed for life, and had not the feeling of responsibility which should be possessed by persons in their position, nor had they any incentive or inducement to thoroughly discharge their duties. In all honorary bodies the control, he observed, fell upon a zealous few who undertook the duties which others neglected. So in this Bill it was intended to introduce something more of the responsible element by proposing the election of certain members of the Senate by the Convocation and being elected for a short term of five years, something like zeal and interest in the welfare of the institution would be infused. These were something like the features of the Bill, and as far as the principle of the Bill was concerned he considered it