

character of the present Chief Superintendent of Education, and of the opposition with which he had been by the press of Ontario within met past few years.

Mr SINCLAIR said that to judge by the remarks of the some hon. gentlemen, the whole Canadian system of education, was embodied in the Chief Superintendent of Education he gave that gentleman all the credit for his wisdom in framing a system of education that would meet the requirements of the people, but primarily it was the people of this country to whom the chief credit was due. Our people came from countries in which good systems of popular education prevailed, and they would see to it that their educational interests did not suffer. He was very sorry to hear any reflections cast upon the Council of Public Instruction, for it was composed of gentlemen whom he believed had honestly endeavoured to do their duty, and to whom the country owed a debt of gratitude. He pointed out that virtually our school system would remain unchanged under a Minister of Education. He also deprecated continual attacks upon party and politics; he had seen no evils arising from improper party spirit, and we should feel thankful that the mother land had given us a political system which had here and in Britain been so eminently successful. He did not feel a particle of apprehension that party considerations were going to work out the evils in educational matters which some hon. members were predicting. This cry of "party" was a mere bugbear conjured up for the purpose of getting an advantage over the Government with respect to the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. CAMERON said it was unprecedented that the second reading of so important a Bill should take place on the day on which it was placed in the hands of hon. members. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MOWAT said that no objection had been taken when the Bill was introduced, and they had now been discussing it all day. He did not feel disposed to adjourn the debate.

Mr. CAMERON thought no satisfactory reason had been given against the adjournment, and so important a measure as this should go to the country before it was rushed through the House. If the Attorney-General persisted in his refusal there was a constitutional way in which they could prevent the Bill being passed to-night, and members on this side of the House would exercise the power they thus possessed. He proceeded to criticise the details of the Bill. The Bill did not explain whether or not the Department of Education was to be attached to the office of Provincial Secretary, or if a new Department was to be created. He thought, too, that so radical a change as the one proposed should not be made in the Government without the new Minister going to his constituents. As a fossil Tory he himself did not consider this necessary, but it was a principle always contended for by the Reform party. He charged that supporters of the Government disregarded their own intelligence, and accorded a subservient and slavish support to the Administration. Such a change as the one sought had been proposed under the Sandfield Macdonald Government, but that Administration had refused to make it. He believed that it was a feeling of pride in the mind of the Chief Superintendent which had led him to recommend that his mantle should fall on no one less than a member of the Executive. The head of the Department of Education should be permanent and not changed at the wish of the people. In the time of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Government, a Committee of enquiry to investigate the affairs of the Educational Department had been asked and granted, while no later than last night a similar enquiry into Crown Lands administration had been refused by the Government, and so it would be with regard to the Department of Education under its new auspices. The Government had not shown that the present system had been a failure, and yet they proposed to make the change and to carry it in one short sitting. The Government should not get through with this measure as easily as they thought. Adjournment after adjournment would be moved, and he, therefore, moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FINLAYSON suggested that it would be well that the member for East Toronto should attend more to the business of the House instead of attending to his own business during the day, and coming here at night to interrupt the proceedings of

the House.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) said this measure had been foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne, had been indicated by addresses in the country, and had been fully justified by the organs of both parties in this city. He should therefore vote against the motion of the member for East Toronto.

The House divided, and the motion to adjourn was lost. Yeas, 19; nays, 31.

YEAS—Messrs. Bell, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Cole, Creighton, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, McDougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Simcoe), McRae, Monk, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Wills—19.

NAYS—Messrs. Appleby, Bishop, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Dawson, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham (Lambton), Grant, Haney, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Laue, McMahon, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (Essex), Patterson (York), Paxton, Sinclair, Snettinger, Springer, Watterworth, Wilson, Wood—32.

Mr. Flesher, for, paired with Mr. Ross against the amendment.

Mr. Wigle, for, paired with Mr. Watterworth against the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM (Lambton) pointed out that the member for East Toronto had come to the House late, and had interfered with members who had been working in the interests of the country since 9 o'clock this morning. The member for East Toronto had been attending to his fees, and now proposed to speak against time in order to delay business. He did not believe the House would allow the Opposition to carry their point.

Mr. BELL thought there should be an adjournment insisted on in order to give more time for consideration of this question. He saw no reason for the proposed change, and hoped some hon. gentleman would move the adjournment of the House. (Cries of "Move it yourself.")

Mr. BOULTER believed the Bill would be adopted, but still advocated the postponement of the second reading. He moved "That the Bill be not now read a second time, but be read a second time on Tuesday next."

Mr. CAMERON again urged that there was reason for an adjournment, as members had not received their copies of the Bill yet.

Mr. WOOD said the Bill was distributed on Wednesday.

Mr. Cameron and Mr. Macdougall denied the statement.

Mr. Finlayson and Mr. Richardson stated that they had received their copies of the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON went on to urge that in view of the thin House there should be an adjournment. He went on to speak against time.

Mr. LAUDER announced that if the House sat till Monday he would read the "almanack" every time a motion was made.

The House divided, and the motion was lost. Yeas, 22; nays, 31.

FRIDAY, Jan. 21.

#### THE EDUCATION BILL.

Mr. CAMERON said the third section proposed a change of emolument in regard to the gentleman who was to occupy the position of Minister of Education, and must, therefore, be originated in Committee of the Whole. He raised this as a question of order.

After some remarks by Mr. Macdougall (Simcoe),

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the objection was not at present well founded.

Mr. WILLS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BRODER spoke against time for one hour. Mr. Rosevear and Mr. Barr spoke shortly.

Mr. CAMERON followed, reading from the files of THE GLOBE for nearly an hour.

At 2:10 a.m.,

Mr. HODGINS suggested that the debate should be brought to a close.

Mr. CREIGHTON then rose and spoke for an hour and a half, when

Mr. MEREDITH called attention to the fact that there was no quorum, and the Speaker immediately adjourned the House at 3:40 a.m.

#### PRIVATE BILLS.

The following private Bills were passed through committee:—

To amend the Act for the construction of Water Works in the Town of St. Catharines.—Mr. Currie.