

nor in Council, the appointment of these officers was now virtually in the hands of the Government. With regard to the question of text books, the actions of the Lieutenant-Governor would in that, as in other matters, be more flexible than those of the Council of Public Instruction. A great deal of the information upon which that body now acted was derived from extraneous sources, and there was nothing to hinder a Committee of the Executive Council from resorting to the same sources. The Chief Superintendent was now practically responsible for every matter relating to the financial administration of the Educational Department; the responsibility of the Government was formal rather than substantial. Reference had been made to the appointment of High School Inspectors, as likely to become a matter of party, but it was never found on a change of Government that such officers as these lost their places unless on the most substantial grounds. The case which had been referred to as having happened in Guelph, and attributed to political feeling, would be found, if the hon. gentleman took the trouble of investigating it, to have been purely and solely a legal question, in which the Council of Public Instruction had unwittingly contravened the law. The question was simply whether or not the Council should have the power of at will repealing the provisions of an Act of Parliament. It had been said the proposed change was premature, yet the press of the country from one end to the other, irrespective of party, had advocated the principle involved in this very measure. The measure was by no means a revolutionary one, for they had precedents for it both in the experiences of England and Scotland. The inspectors in England and Scotland were appointed by the Privy Council, and the distribution of the Parliamentary grant depended upon the recommendation of those inspectors. What the ratepayers and all concerned in working out our school system wanted was a closer responsibility, which would be secured by this measure.

Mr. CAMERON said his Conservative principles led him to oppose altering any system which had worked well in the past. No argument had been advanced to show that the change would work any improvement. The Treasurer had a degree from a university, but there were scarcely five men on either side who occupied the same position, and this legislation was not for the present but for the future. He believed no change should be made, and therefore supported the amendment.

Mr. HODGINS said the Opposition were asking the House to negative the policy which had long been advocated by Dr. Ryerson. He regretted that the Opposition had intentionally or unintentionally introduced the political element into this matter. He hoped hereafter they would avoid making it a political question in elections. The present Chief Superintendent was not a graduate of a university, and therefore the argument of the hon. gentleman on that point had no application. He agreed with the measure in all its details, and thought the time had come when the Government should take the control of this important Department. Ontario had reason to be proud of her educational system, and he had no doubt that in future it would be as successful and as non-political as in the past.

Mr. RICHARDSON said he believed the time had arrived when a change should be made in our educational system. He thought, however, that the Government should give some indication as to what body they intended to ask to assist them in the matter. He should vote against the amendment.

The House then divided, and the amendment was lost; yeas, 25, nays, 45.

YEAS—Messrs Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Cameron, Contis, Creighton, Deacon, Flasher, Graham (Frontenac), Grange, Lauder, McDougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Simcoe), McKee, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Preston, Rosevear, Tooley, Wigle—25

NAYS—Messrs. App'by, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Duroche, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Gow, Graham (Lambton), Lyson, Haney, Hardy, Hargrave, Hodgins, Kean, Lane, McCraney, McGowan, McLeod, McManis, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Richardson, Robinson, Sexton, Sinclair, Snelinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdfield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—45.

Mr. Scott for the amendment paired with Mr. Hay against.

Mr. Long for paired with Mr. Hunter against.

Mr. Baker for paired with Mr. Lyon against.

The motion for the second reading was

then carried.

Mr. MOWAT moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 12:40 a.m.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Scott—Thursday—Address for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Ontario and the Dominion Government in reference to the navigation of the inland waters of the Province between Lakefield and Balsam Lake.

Hon. Mr. Currie—Of S. Davis, et al, of Clifton, praying that the License Bill now before the House may not pass.

Mr. Clarke (Norfolk)—Of the Township Council of Windham respecting the Municipal Loan Fund.

Mr. Clarke (Norfolk)—Of the Temperance Association of Ottawa, praying for an investigation into the mode of issuing licenses in Ottawa.

Mr. Lyon—Of the Township Council of Trafalgar, praying that an Act may pass to prohibit the sale of liquor where other goods are sold.