

Division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Bell, Creighton, McDougall, McMahon, Meredith, Monk, Preston, Sinclair—8.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Cole, Coutts, Crooks, Currie, Deacon, Finlayson, Fisher, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Harkin, Hunter, Kean, Lane, Lauder, Long, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCraney, McGowan, McLaws, Massie, Master, Miller, Morris, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Rosevear, Ross, Scott, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, White, Widdifield, Williams, Wood—47.

Mr. BELL moved, "That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by providing that nominations and elections of Public and Separate School trustees in the city of Toronto shall be held at the same time and place, and by the same deputy returning-officers, and be conducted in the same manner, the voting being by ballot, as nominations and elections for aldermen." He believed he was only doing his duty in bringing the matter up in the way he had done. He had been requested to do so by numbers of his Catholic constituents, and indeed every one he had spoken to, with but a single exception, had expressed himself in favour of the course he had taken. He made the motion altogether in the interests of the Separate Schools. He understood perfectly well how the petitions against the use of the ballot in Separate School elections had been got up in the city of Toronto. The Roman Catholic clergy, by themselves and by their agents, stood at the church doors and canvassed for names to be attached to the petitions. They were got up solely by the clergy, and in many cases the signatures were put down very much against the wish of those who had reluctantly to sign. On the other hand, the petitions asking for the ballot were signed voluntarily, and those whose names appeared on them represented over \$2,000,000 worth of property. If the change were not granted, the support of this large amount of property would be withdrawn from the Separate Schools, which would dwindle down into a state of inefficiency, and the burden of their maintenance would be thrown upon a few who would be unable to bear it.

Mr. FRASER said that when he recollected that only two or three years ago the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had attended a meeting held in the city park at which a resolution was unanimously passed in the direction of abolishing Separate Schools, and when he recollected that the hon. gentleman had made a speech on that occasion and had taken part in the proceedings, he could pretty well understand his position in regard to Separate Schools. He (Mr. Fraser) did not doubt that he was making this motion in what he believed to be the interests of the Separate Schools, viz., that they should not exist. And when he further recollected that an organ of the hon. gentleman's party—the *Orange Sentinel*—had been for weeks and months demanding that they should be abolished, he could quite understand why he should be championing this question of the Separate Schools. And he could fully appreciate why the hon. gentleman rejoiced at the idea that ratepayers of the city of Toronto representing so large an amount of rateable property as \$2,000,000, and who now supported Separate Schools, should cease to do so. It was very evident why the hon. gentleman was so zealous in promoting the change he sought, because he knew perfectly well that in the more he fomented the difficulty, the more he disturbed and disquieted the matter, the nearer he would come to gaining the object he doubtless desired. He told the hon. gentleman that when he asked that the city of Toronto Separate School trustee elections should be held on the same day as municipal elections, he was asking for what those who had signed the petition did not desire. If he wished to injure the Separate Schools in Toronto, an easy method would be to increase the expenditure, and one way of doing that would be to hold their trustee elections on the same day and at all the places at which municipal elections were held. A very great factor in maintaining the Separate Schools was their cheapness; but the proposal of the hon. gentleman struck directly at the root of cheapness. He had it on the very best authority that many of those who had signed the petitions did not know that they were asking that Separate School elections should be held on the same day as municipal elections. And though the hon. gentleman had presented a petition signed by two hundred asking for this change, there had been presented petitions signed by eight hundred against it. Yet the hon. gentleman's position in regard to those eight hundred was that they did not know what they were asking for. The hon. member had said that he had met only one of his Catholic constituents that did not wish the change. He could only say that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of his constituency was very limited. He (Mr. Fraser) was aware that numbers were opposed to it, and since the matter had been introduced he had been deluged with letters and telegrams asking that it be not made. No greater blow could be struck against the Separate Schools of the city of Toronto than to carry out the object sought by the hon. member. His position was that it was necessary to protect the Catholic people of this Province against their own clergy. The Catholic clergy had made large sacrifices, and had been unremitting in their efforts to make these schools a success. They had put their hands in their pockets to contribute to their aid, and there had been no diligence that had not been exercised in their support. The man who, knowing what the Catholic clergy had done for the Separate Schools, said that the Catholic people of this Province had to be protected against their own clergy, uttered a slander for which there was no foundation. (Hear, hear.) He was not prepared to stand there, as a Roman Catholic, and allow such an aspersion to be made without resenting it as it deserved to be resented. (Cheers.)

Mr. McMAHON opposed the motion, as he did not think a law should be passed affecting the city of Toronto alone. If the change would be good for Toronto it would be good for the whole Province.

Mr. CURRIE did not think that special legislation should be passed in the matter of extending the ballot to Separate Schools. Should he become convinced by next session that the Catholic people of the country were in favour of the proposed change, he would have great pleasure in supporting it. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MEREDITH, while in favour of the ballot, thought it wrong in principle to legislate specially for the city of Toronto alone.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE knew something of the relations of the Catholic people of the city to their

clergy, and thought they would likely get along all right without the legislation of the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. DEACON said the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment had done nothing more than his duty in bringing before the House the views of his constituents. He was not in accord of the amendment, for he had never favoured the ballot system, but he thought the hon. gentleman deserved credit for the manly way in which he had brought it forward.

Mr. SINCLAIR, in supporting the amendment, disclaimed any intention of interfering with the Separate School system, as that was assured by the British North America Act. If the principle of the amendment was a correct one, and could not be provided for the whole Province, it should be given to the city of Toronto if they desired it.

The amendment was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Bell, Sinclair—2.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Bishop, Bonfield, Boulter, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Coutts, Creighton, Crooks, Currie, Deacon, Finlayson, Fisher, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Harkin, Hunter, Kean, Lane, Lauder, Long, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCraney, McGowan, McLaws, McMahon, Massie, Master, Meredith, Miller, Monk, Morris, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Preston, Rosevear, Ross, Scott, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, White, Widdifield, Williams, Wood—54.

Mr. CODE moved to refer the Bill back to Committee to be amended by striking out the amount to be paid by County Councils to Collegiate Institutes. He claimed that as they had already to duplicate the Government grant to High Schools, it was too much to make them pay \$750 to the Collegiate Institutes as well.

The amendment was declared lost on division.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

ELECTIONS TO THE ASSEMBLY.

The Bill to make further provisions respecting elections to the Legislative Assembly was referred back to Committee of the Whole for certain amendments, which having been made, the Committee rose and reported.

Mr. CREIGHTON moved that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole to be amended by striking out section 13, so as to leave the village of Blythe in the Riding of West Huron for electoral purposes.

The amendment was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Bell, Boulter, Creighton, Deacon, Fisher, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, McDougall, McGowan, Meredith, Monk, Morris, Preston, Rosevear, Scott, White—13.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Crooks, Currie, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Hunter, Lane, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McLaws, McMahon, Massie, Master, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson, Ross, Sinclair, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wood—34.

The Bill was read a third time.

RETURNS.

The following returns were presented by the Provincial Secretary:—

Statement of the receipts and expenditure of the Province from 1867.

Summary of the arguments of counsel in the Boundaries Arbitration.

The House adjourned at one o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 2:30 o'clock.

TORONTO CONSOLIDATION ACT.

The Bill respecting the re-consolidation and future limitation of the general debenture debt of the city of Toronto was read a third time, the title being given, "An Act respecting the debenture debt and certain property in the city of Toronto."

MUNICIPAL ACT.

The Bill to amend the Municipal Act was referred to Committee of the Whole for certain amendments.

Upon section 22,

Mr. MEREDITH thought it most undesirable in small cities to give the authority in matters of salary and numbers of the police force into the hands of the City Council, as there was a Board of Police Commissioners already appointed for each city, and this would simply divide the responsibility without doing any real good.

Mr. HARDY said the vote in Committee had been almost unanimous. It was thought that in small cities the Board was sometimes too extravagant in their ideas, so that they added unnecessarily to the expense of the police. If there was to be a motion made he thought the hon. member for West Hastings, who had suggested the amendment, should be notified.

Mr. MEREDITH said he did not desire to make any motion, but simply to call the attention of the Attorney-General to this clause, as he thought it a mischievous one.

Mr. CURRIE said that there would be a number of cities affected by the clause, and if it were passed the Board of Police Commissioners in those places might just as well be wiped out, and indeed that would be the practical effect. When the power to fix the number of policemen and the rate of their pay was taken from the Boards he had no doubt they would cease to exist.

The clause was carried.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill as amended, and it was read a third time and passed.

THE MEDICAL ACT.

Mr. MOWAT moved that the order for the second reading of the Bill to amend the Ontario Medical Act be discharged. He had found that there was some difference of opinion as to the good effects of the proposed legislation, and he had therefore determined to allow the Bill to drop, and to send a despatch through the Lieutenant-Governor to the Imperial Government, in the hope that the obnoxious legislation would be repealed.

The motion was carried.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.