a return showing the numbers, names, places of residence, profession or trade, length of time of attendance, as well as the subjects taught to each pupil attending the School of Technology or School of Practical Science, since the first day of January, 1874, to the present time, and also showing the names of students in attendance upon the other institutions and the names of such institutions.

Mr. CROOKS said the report which had already been brought down gave nearly all the information desired. A new building had been erected for the School in close proximity to University College, with a staff of four professors, who in addition to their work in University College gave a course of instruction to the students in attendance at the School of Practical Science. Instruction in engineering and chemistry had been provided, and the School was for the first time in possession of the appliances necessary to thorough teaching of the latter subject. The School was now essentially what it was intended to be, and had been made so at a very moderate outlay. For $5,000 the Province was getting the advantages which a formal College of Technology would not provide under $25,000. The Institution was now extremely serviceable, especially in the department of mining engineering, which was so useful in the circumstances of the Province, and for the first time put the country in a position to turn out civil engineers of superior acquisitions. He had strong hopes that the School would prove an immense benefit to the Province at a very small expenditure.

Mr. LAUDER asked whether there had been any improvements in the attendance of late.

Mr. CROOKS said the attendance had improved, and the thorough and complete course of instruction which had been provided would doubtless make it larger. Mechanics had now an opportunity of obtaining a higher knowledge of everything which did not go to make up a literary education. It was as much a College for the mechanic as the Agricultural College was for the farmer or the University for the professional man.

Mr. BELL thought that the return would show that seven-tenths of the pupils attending the School of Practical Science were in attendance at University College or at other places of instruction. He contended that the School had been diverted from its original object by being taken away from the mechanic and given to the professional man.

Mr. LAUDER said that the School had been established for the mechanical classes, and thought the money expended on the institution had been spent to a great extent uselessly. But they had it on their hands and they should endeavour to put it, as best they could, to the purposes for which it had been founded. The situation of the School was also an unfortunate one. If the Minister of Education had selected a site with the idea of putting it out of the reach or knowledge of the class who would be likely to attend it, he could not have obtained a better one than he had.

Mr. MEREDITH quoted the statement of Mr. Blake when the School was founded, that it was to be a separate institution, and that a portion of the endowment of University College should be devoted to its purposes. He contended that the proper course to be carried out was that the University should assume the School as one of its branches, and thus relieve the Province of the burden of its maintenance.

Mr. MERRICK also spoke in favour of the School of Technology being made a charge upon the University Endowment Fund.

The motion was then carried.

CIVIL CAUSES.

Mr. MONK moved for the second reading of his Bill relating to the trial of civil causes. The Bill was to establish an order in the trial of non-jury and jury cases in the Court of *Nisi Prius*, so that the latter would be heard first. This would be more convenient for jurors, and would tend to lessen the expense attendant on the sittings of the Court, because the jurors would not have to wait while the trial of non-jury cases was going on, as they were sometimes required to do now. He found that since last session the judges had carried out the provisions of the Bill, but not with uniformity.

Mr. MOWAT did not think there was any practical evil to be corrected by this Bill, as the judges generally acted upon the principles laid down in it. The judges now exercised discretionary powers with good effect in deciding upon the order of cases, and it would not be for the benefit of the country to remove these powers. They ought not to be bound down by a certain rule of order, because it could not be executed without trouble and difficulty to the Court, as well as to suitors,

Mr. McLAWS thought that the Bill would reduce the expense to counties in the payment of jurymen.

Mr. DEROCHE said in his section of country he had never heard the least complaint on this subject. The judges exercised prudence in deciding upon the order of cases. Many non-jury cases were of such a nature that they could be disposed of in less than an hour, and consequently it was not fair to put suitors to the expense of paying witnesses and other costs in waiting until jury cases were disposed of. In the nterest of justice the Bill should not be passed.

Mr. ROSS believed that the principle of the Bill was carried out in most instances by the judges, but still it would be better to have the order defined by statute. The lawyers sometimes arranged beforehand in what order the cases should be heard, and the judges, not wishing to act arbitrarily in the matter, agreed to this order, although it might necessitate a longer detention of the jurors and thereby increase the expense. If the profession knew distinctly in what order cases would be called they would be more diligent in having their witnesses on hand and everything ready to proceed at once, thus avoiding delays, which were to the loss of the country.

Mr. DEACON said that if there was any ground of complaint on the part of suitors in non-jury cases, it was in postponing their cases until jury cases had been disposed of, thus subjecting them in many instances to a loss of both time and money. If they were to have a reform in this direction it was only to be obtained by wiping out the juries in civil causes altogether, because it was becoming more apparent every day that their services were not required in such cases, the judge being able to deal with the same alone.

Mr. HARDY recognised the advisability of having the jury cases disposed of first as far as possible. This view had been previously expressed in this House, and the judges had carried it out to a large extent. But it would not do to bind the judges down to a rule. The option and opinion of the judge should prevail, that being the true way in which the administration of justice ought to be carried out. An established order would not only hamper the judges, but it would fall very hard upon suitors in the way of additional expense and loss of time. Besides, in non-jury cases involving large sums of money it might prove disastrous to put them off, even for a few days.

Mr. FRASER said that in many instances the cast-iron rule which the hon. gentleman proposed would work grievous wrongs to suitors, who had to be considered just as well as a county and others. Juries were summoned to try criminal cases as well as civil cases; and even after the latter were disposed of the jurors had to wait until the criminal business was concluded. This House could lay down no law as to the order in which criminal cases should be tried, and it would be arbitrary to do so in civil causes. The judges as a rule exercised admirable discretion in hearing cases, and their power in this respect should not be limited. Under these circumstances, and considering the fact that many lawyers in the House sustained the present mode of procedure in preference to the proposed change, he submitted to his hon. friend that he ought to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. MILLER said if the Bill would effect any saving to the country or reduce lawyers' fees (laughter) he would support it. But as he didn't think either of these desirable ends would follow its adoption he could not vote for it.

Mr. SCOTT said although the Bill was rather stringent in its terms it could be easily modified in Committee. It should be made applicable to the County Court as well as the higher Court.

The motion for the second reading of the Bill was then put and lost on the following division.

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, McDougall, McGowan, McLaws, Master, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morris, O'Sullivan, Preston, Richardson, Robinson, Ross, Scott, Tooley, Wigle, Wills —33.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baxter, Bishop, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Deroche, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Harcourt, Hardy, Hay, Hunter, Lane, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCraney, McMahon, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Sinclair-Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—37.

THE ELECTION ACT.

Mr. MORRIS moved the second reading of his Bill to amend the Election Act of Ontario as far as related to income voters. As the law now stood, income voters were required to take an oath that they had paid their taxes for the year. It was a practice in cities and towns of the Province to collect the taxes in instalments, and consequently when a man came to vote he could not honestly say that he had paid them, although he had paid part of them. He thought the form of oath should be changed so as to meet the form of the instalment by-law.

Mr. MOWAT said he had no objection to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MEREDITH said at present a man assessed for $400 income could not vote unless he had paid taxes on the same. This disability ought to be removed, so that the fact of a man being on the assessment roll for income should entitle him to vote whether he had actually paid taxes for the year or not. He hoped that when the Bill was considered in Committee the Attorney-General would insert a clause to amend the law in this respect.

Mr. CURRIE was not in favour of the proposed amendment to the Income Voters' Bill. The enactment that income voters should pay their tax before being allowed to vote was not confined to them, but applied to several other classes of voters, and was, he believed, a just one.

Mr. ROSS held that the ground upon which the franchise was extended to income voters was not that that class was possessed of more intelligence than other classes, but because they had property of a certain kind, upon which they were entitled to a vote. It was but just to enforce the provision that income voters should pay their tax before voting, as the municipality had no other penalty with which they could visit the derelict income voter. He concurred, however, in the clause which, in places where the tax was paid in instalments, allowed income voters to vote if they had paid an instalment of their tax.

Mr. WIDDIFIELD corrected the statement of the leader of the Opposition that the income voters, as a class, were opposed to the present Administration. It might be so in London, but in his own constituency he knew that the income voters, of whom the number was not large, cast their votes in favour of the Government of his hon. friend the Attorney-General.

Mr. CREIGHTON supported the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a select Committee consisting of Messrs. Mowat, Hardy, Wilson, Harcourt, Meredith, Deacon, Currie, and the mover.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

CORRECTION.

Mr. WHITE corrected a report of his speech that had appeared in THE GLOBE, by which he was represented as advocating the abolition of the Court of Appeal. What he had recommended was a reduction in the number of the judges of that Court to three, the restriction of its jurisdiction so far as related to appeals from the Courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, and Common Pleas, and the alteration of its constitution to the former basis, with an appeal direct to the Supreme Court.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Bills passed through Committee:—

To incorporate the town of Mount Forest—Mr. McGowan.

Respecting the township of Harvey in the county of Peterboro—Mr. Deroche.

On the Bill respecting the Stratford and Huron Railway Company—Mr. Hay,

Mr. HUNTER moved that the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th clauses be struck out. Some of the townships in his constituency through which the Bill ran had voted bonuses upon certain conditions, and these clauses gave the Company power to abrogate them