

which was better security? Again, if a man bought land from the Government, though he had only paid one instalment, he was obliged to pay taxes on the whole value of the land. He thought some provision should be made for taxing professional money lenders, and approved of the principle of the Bill.

Mr. McMANUS thought it was premature to discuss the Bill at present. He thought it best to let the Bill come from the Special Committee first.

Mr. WOOD, (Victoria) observed, in reference to the argument of the member for South Ontario that the amount of a mortgage should be deducted from the assessment of the land which was mortgaged, that that would not work in cases where the title of land was disputed. In a case where a man borrowed \$2,000 on his land, his land was worth just that much less whether he gave his note or a mortgage. If he gave his note it was taxed, but a mortgage was not. He could see no reason for taxing one and not the other. With regard to the proposal to deduct a man's indebtedness from his assessment he pointed out that in the case above the money was owed to parties outside the Province. In that case it escaped taxation altogether. The correct principle was to assess property wherever they found it.

Mr. GIBBONS thought the assessor should not be embarrassed any more than could be possibly helped and that he should be allowed to make the assessment as hitherto. He was sworn to do his duty and do it correctly, and he was of opinion that officer should be allowed all the liberties he had enjoyed previously. He (Mr. Gibbons) was opposed to the clause having reference to the administering of oaths to the owner of the property, and recommended that it should be struck out.

Mr. GRAHAM disagreed with the hon.

member for South Victoria that property should be taxed wherever it may be found. He thought the best plan would be to defer all amendments this session and let the Government bring in a consolidated law next session.

Mr. RYKERT sympathized with the Hon. Mr. Crooks, who had a Committee of Twenty-one for the consideration. The members of that Committee would do as they pleased and give the hon. gentleman a good deal of trouble. He was quite aware that he would stumble into a bumble-bee's nest in touching the question, but he thought a Committee might after discussing this question, be able to report certain amendments which would be recognised by the Government. He thought there would be no harm in a Committee considering it and making a report, and he proposed that the Government should let the matter go to a Committee, and if they were not satisfied with the result, he would not press it.

The motion on being put was declared lost.

Mr. RYKERT called for yeas and nays, but there not being five members to call for him, they were not taken.

The motion was consequently lost.

PARTITION OF REAL ESTATE.

Mr. Bethune's Bill to amend the law respecting the partition of real estate was read a second time, and referred to a Special Committee.

COUNCIL OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) moved for all correspondence, or copies thereof, had between any member of the Executive Council of this Province and the Council of Public Instruction, the Chief Superintendent of Education, or other members of the Council, since the passing of the Act 35 Vic., chap. 30, "making temporary provision as to the Regulations of the Council of Public Instruction," and since the date of the last return from the Education Department.—Carried.

TAVERN AND SHOP LICENSES.

Mr. GRANGE moved for a return giving the number of tavern and shop licenses issued during the year 1872, together with the name of township, town, and city where in such licenses were issued, with the number of licenses issued in each township, town or city respectively within the Province, and the amount actually received by the Government in respect thereof.—Carried.

DIVISION COURTS.

Mr. McLEOD moved for copies of all reports from the Inspector of Division Courts touching the working and general condition of the offices of said courts. He thought the appointment of clerks of Division Courts

should be taken out of the hands of the County Judges and placed in the hands of the Government, the office to be held during good behaviour.

Mr. McDONALD objected to taking the appointment of clerks out of the hands of the county judges.

Mr. DEACON pointed out that the fees to the clerks were so small that in some cases the judge found it difficult to get a competent person to accept the office.

Mr. LAUDER suggested that correspondence between the Government and the inspectors be included in the motion.

Mr. McMANUS observed that the information asked for had to be given to the county judges twice a year by the clerks.

Mr. SNETSINGER said that the Division Courts in the eastern portion of the Province had worked remarkably well, and he would be very sorry to see those courts abolished.

Attorney-General MOWAT remarked that some of these reports were confidential, and of course could not be brought down.

Mr. M. C. CAMERON was not aware that any information submitted to the Government by Division Court Clerks was necessarily confidential. He went on to mention a rumour that John H. Greer, an issuer of licenses in Hamilton, had been dismissed.

Mr. PRINCE observed that after the "Speak now" business he did not wonder that the hon. member for East Toronto did not see any necessity for withholding confidential communications. (Laughter).

Dr. CLARKE said that it was a usual thing for every dollar collected through the Division Courts to cost three dollars. He would have been glad, therefore, to have the number of suits and the amounts collected laid before the House, so that that fact might be made apparent. He would like to see these courts abolished.

Mr. DEROCHE spoke favourably of the working of the Division Courts as far as they had come under his notice, and observed that the only objection against them was that it was difficult to find persons to act as bailiffs and clerks, from the fact that they received such small remuneration.

Mr. GIBSON said his experience in the west had been very different from the experience of gentleman from the east. He would rather lose a sum of money than go into the Division Court to collect it. It would be a move in the right direction if no debt under \$10 or \$20 could be sued for in these Courts. It would tend to public morality, because people could not give credit for such small sums unless they were sure of pay without suing for it. In his county some of the clerks had engaged in the elections, and he thought it would be well to take the franchise from them. He knew of some cases where the judge was almost under the entire control of the clerk.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS explained the cause of the removal of the issuer of tavern licenses in Hamilton. That gentleman was also registrar, and it was thought inadvisable to have a person holding two offices, and so the duties of issuing tavern licenses were transferred to the County Attorney, as in all other counties. It had been said that the reports of Mr. Durand were not accessible to hon. members. Some of the reports contained charges in reference to certain gentlemen, which charges might not be borne out by the data contained in the reports, and which might be of an injurious character. It was, therefore, not desirable to bring them down. The hon. gentleman bore testimony to the efficient and impartial manner in which the County Court judges discharged their duties, whilst the remuneration they received was very small.

Mr. CAMERON said the rule mentioned by the Treasurer had not always been carried out. The issuers of tavern licenses in Leeds and Carleton were registrars.

The motion was carried.

HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria), moved:—

1. For a Copy of the Regulations of the Council of Public Instruction and other instructions relating to the admission of pupils to the High Schools or Collegiate Institutes.
2. A copy of the Order in Council suspending or disallowing these Regulations, and a copy of any instructions issued by the Government to Boards of Trustees on this subject.
3. The number of pupils admitted to each High School and Collegiate Institute since the suspension of these Regulations, the names of the Schools and Institutes, and of the examiners, and the subjects on which the candidates were examined, the extent of the examination in these subjects, and the number of marks obtained by these pupils.