

could not be pleaded in a Court of Justice, and therefore legislation was necessary to settle the matter definitely. The hon. member seemed to think this would injure their friends in some way or other, but that could hardly be, as the petition against it from Blyth was signed by supporters of both parties.

Mr. ROSS repelled the insinuation that it was at his suggestion that the clause relating to the village of Blyth had been placed in the Bill. Until a very short time before the Bill had been introduced he had known nothing whatever about it. He denied that the division of the village would make any difference to him politically, and contended that if it were to be placed wholly in either riding of Huron it would be placed in the East Riding, because that was numerically the weakest. According both to the number of names on the voters' lists and to the number of votes cast at the late Dominion elections the population of West Huron was much the greater. The petition that had been presented to the House against the proposed legislation had been signed upon the understanding that the village was to be placed entirely in the East Riding. That this was the case was shown by the fact that such was the meaning of the words originally at the head of the petition, and into which had been afterwards inserted a phrase to make the petition read in opposition to the village being placed partly in the East Riding. He contended that the action of the Attorney-General was the clearest indication that there was no political reasons for leaving the village for electoral purposes as it originally was.

Mr. MEREDITH said that taking the basis of the figures upon which the Attorney-General had induced the House to assent to the reconstruction of the ridings in Huron, the village should be attached to the West Riding, which was the smaller constituency. The wishes of the people, the tenor of the statutory legislation, and every reason seemed to him to be in favour of attaching the village to the West Riding.

Mr. GIBSON was entirely of opinion that the village should have been placed in the West Riding, and if he could have obtained accurate information as to the population of the ridings, he would insist upon its being placed there now. But there had been no means of ascertaining the exact population of the ridings, and he had seen no way out of the difficulty except by legislation. He had known nothing whatever of the proposed clause previous to the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. CREIGHTON moved that the tenth clause, relating to the village of Blyth, be struck out.

The motion was lost on a division, the vote being 24 to 32.

The Committee then rose and reported progress.

THE SCHOOL ACT.

The House then went into Committee upon the Bill respecting Public, High, and Separate Schools—Mr. Crooks.

Mr. CROOKS explained that he had remodelled the first section so as to allow the School Board of a city to constitute one of the Public Schools a Model School.

Mr. MCGOWAN raised the objection that the form of oath in the Bill would exclude farmers' sons from the school franchise.

Mr. CROOKS said the Bill was not making any changes in the law, which was that no one could vote at a trustee election unless he paid school tax, which would necessarily exclude farmers' sons. He drew attention to an amendment which he had introduced to right an abuse to which his attention had been called by members of the House experienced in school matters. People living outside incorporated villages sometimes secured a colourable tenure of some property therein, so as to be able to send their children to the school, thus securing the privileges of the school without paying school rates. He therefore proposed to strike out of the School Act the sixth section, defining the term "resident," so as to include the children of ratepayers not residing in the village. He further proposed to lower the fee for non-residents from 50c to 25c a month.

Mr. BISHOP congratulated the Minister of Education upon the present state of the School Law, and approved of many of the amendments which were now proposed. He, however, drew attention to some defects in the rules, and suggested improvements. He thought it wrong to force the trustees to engage an extra teacher when the attendance grew to more than fifty, as when the attendance fell in the busy season the second teacher was no longer required. He believed that the teacher was the real life of a school, and trusted parents would see that the teachers were men who were interested in their schools. (Cheers.) The teaching of too many branches was one of the great faults of our schools, for a few subjects well grounded would be of more value than a number only superficially taught.

The Committee rose and reported, and asked leave to sit again.

GRAND JURORS.

Mr. HARDY introduced a Bill respecting Grand Jurors, which was read a first time.

Mr. MEREDITH drew attention to a letter which had appeared in the papers from the Mayor of Ottawa touching upon the action of the hon. member for North Renfrew in connection with the Bill upon the Ottawa Street Railway Company. The hon. member was well known as one of the most faithful and intelligent members of the House, and he (Mr. Meredith) doubted if this was not a breach of the privilege of this Legislature.

Mr. FRASER agreed with the last speaker, and thought this a most reprehensible interference with the business of this House, and an attempt to influence the views of hon. members, particularly as the letter had been put in circular form and placed upon the desks of hon. members.

Mr. CROOKS, as Chairman of the Railway Committee, said that the Bill referred to in this correspondence had, like many others, been hotly contested in Committee. He claimed that this Legislative Assembly understood thoroughly its responsibilities, and was at least as free from anything like lobbying as any legislative body in the world. He also bore testimony to the hon. member's conscientious and intelligent discharge of his duties as a member of the House.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said that the hon. member for North Renfrew had insinuated that the petition in

favour of the Bill was a bogus one; and had said that the promoter of the Bill was responsible for any irregularity in connection with it. This was an imputation against himself.

Mr. DEACON said he had made no imputation against the hon. member, but he was informed that the petition was got up on altogether a different matter, and had been used to further this Bill. What he had said was against the promoters of the Bill, not necessarily the hon. gentleman whose name appeared on the back of it.

The House adjourned at 6:15 until 11 o'clock tomorrow.