

owed to take affidavits anywhere.

Mr. CURRIE thought an individual who was a fit and proper person to act as a Commissioner in one county was an equally fit and proper person to act in another. He asked that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. FRASER said the strong argument in favour of the present system was that it afforded security that any declaration or affidavit that was made had been taken before a properly constituted officer. The signature of a Commissioner was generally well known in the locality in which he resided, and if the law were changed in the manner proposed there would be no guarantee that the affidavit or declaration was properly made, or, indeed, made at all.

Mr. MEREDITH saw no necessity for the Bill.

Mr. MOWAT asked that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. CURRIE, on the suggestion of the hon. Attorney-General, would consent to the withdrawal of the Bill.

LICENSE COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. MEREDITH moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Municipal Act. He said that in proposing to amend the law by providing that no License Commissioner should be eligible for a seat in a municipal Council, he was actuated by a desire to relieve the Government from their present position as they had always declared it to be their policy not to allow the same individual to occupy both positions.

Mr. MOWAT said the only objection to a Commissioner or License Inspector sitting in a municipal Council was the undue influence he might be able to exert for his own election. The Government had always been very emphatic in discountenancing such elections.

Mr. MEREDITH—Except in South Oxford.

Mr. MOWAT said in that case the election was by acclamation. He saw no objection to any person holding a municipal office, after his appointment as Commissioner or Inspector. Out of upwards of two hundred and fifty Commissioners and ninety Inspectors he was aware of only some five or six who occupied seats in municipal Councils. He did not, however, object to the matter being regulated by law. He supposed the hon. member did not propose to make the Bill retrospective.

Mr. MEREDITH said he did not.

Mr. MOWAT said in that case he would assent to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CREIGHTON thought the hon. Attorney-General was mistaken in his statement that very few Inspectors or Commissioners held municipal offices, as several instances had come under his own notice. His hon. friend had also forgotten that the municipal elections were held annually, and that if members of Councils occupied a position on the license board they would be apt to pave their way for re-election by means of the influence they thus acquired.

Several hon. members testified to the fact that in their ridings gentlemen combined the positions of license inspector or commissioner with a seat at the municipal Council, to the satisfaction of the people.

Mr. FLESHER said that he had called the attention of the Provincial Secretary last session to the fact that one of the license commissioners in his riding held a seat in the municipal Council, and he had understood the Provincial Secretary to say then that such appointments would not be made in the future. Notwithstanding that, the same gentleman still occupied both positions.

Mr. HARDY said that probably the difficulty would be met by the Bill proposed by the hon. member for London.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) would like to see a provision added which would render persons engaged in the liquor traffic ineligible to sit on license boards.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

Mr. SCOTT moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act respecting the income and property of the University of Toronto, University College, and Upper Canada College. The Bill proposed to add to the 18th section of the University Act a

clause providing that any appropriation of the endowment fund of the University for permanent purposes should first receive the sanction of the Legislature. The large appropriation that had been made for permanent repairs upon the Upper Canada College building had been made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council without the opportunity having been taken of consulting the Legislature on the matter. Such a course was in opposition to the principles so strongly upheld by hon. gentlemen opposite when they opposed the railway policy of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald.

Mr. CROOKS did not intend to offer any opposition to the principles contained in the Bill. The course the Government had adopted in the appropriation referred to was the one that had always been followed by this and every preceding Government. The foundation of the endowment had been laid in 1798, when the Imperial Parliament set apart a large area of land for the purpose of promoting higher education. The management of the funds accruing from the endowment was, however, until 1853 very faulty, and in that year an Act was passed by which provision was made for its better control. Since that year it would be found that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council had assumed the right to deal with the endowment. Strong representations had been made to the Government that the accommodation afforded by Upper Canada College was not at all adequate, and that its interests were being sacrificed and prejudiced by the condition of the buildings. The Government had believed that they were justified in granting an Order in Council by which the accommodation of the College could be increased, and the work had been done at a very low price in consequence of the cheapness of labour and material. The result of the improvements made under that Order in Council had been to give Upper Canada College for the first time sufficient school room and appliances for the pupils in attendance. There was nothing in the exercise of the powers vested in the Government by the Act of 1853 that could be complained of, and at the same time, the principle enunciated by the hon. member who had introduced the Bill was entirely the result of party political education the Conservative had been receiving at the hands of the Reformers. He congratulated hon. gentlemen opposite upon their having learned the lessons which they on that side of the House were from time to time giving them. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He would call attention to the surprisingly large number of graduates who had issued from the University, as showing the efficiency of that institution. Of late years it had retained a number of feeders in the High Schools and other institutions, and the result had been that no less than one hundred and twenty-nine students had in July last matriculated in the Faculty of Arts, one hundred and eight of whom came from the High Schools.

Mr. SCOTT—How many came from Upper Canada College?

Mr. CROOKS said that ten had come from there. The Senate, instead of, as formerly, being composed of heterogeneous and antagonistic elements, was now a well-organized body, exercising their powers very satisfactorily. There were connected with it some of the most distinguished men in the Province, and its constitution gave a full opportunity of putting the endowment to the best purpose. They had now a system which thoroughly remedied the defects in the former mode of managing the financial affairs of the University. There were proper checks upon the expenditure, and the disposition of the endowment was thoroughly under control. He had much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Crooks, Morris, Meredith, Desroche, Scott, Wilson, Long, and Harcourt.

CORONERS.

Mr. MONK moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act relating to Coroners.

Mr. MONK thought the present system was unjust, in that it forced the county to pay the expenses of inquests held in cities. The Bill now submitted provided that the order for the costs should be made out upon either the City or the County Treasurer, ac-