

tion had been held into the affairs of Upper Canada College. That investigation had then shown that there was a necessity for the continuance of the College, and he supposed that that necessity still existed. He was satisfied that the feeling of the country was rather in favour of the College. Our High Schools could not exactly fill the place that this institution did.

Mr. ROSS thought it unfair to bring this matter so late before the House. The investigation alluded to by the former speaker had taken place some twelve years ago, and at that time our High Schools were not in the state of efficiency which they are now in. Matters had now entirely changed. The High Schools were cheaper, and quite as efficient as Upper Canada College. Besides, there could be no doubt that at no distant date the ground which the College covered would be taken up for other purposes. It was now too valuable a piece of land to be allowed to remain in the position it was now. He was in favour of waiting until the sense of the country could be gathered on the matter.

Mr. HARCOURT from his own personal knowledge could tell them that the students from country Grammar Schools took a higher place at Toronto University than those from Upper Canada. He compared the High School programme of studies to-day with what it was some years ago. He could point to a few Collegiate Institutes which could give a sounder and better education to a youth than Upper Canada. As a feeder of the University, Upper Canada College was getting behind the age. Gentlemen could be sure that the number of Chairs in Toronto University were far more in need of support than did this Upper Canada College. He spoke of the educational tendencies of this age. These tendencies were toward competitive examinations and natural sciences. The University authorities were unable to follow these tendencies by reason of the poverty of the institution. Let them give the sum spoken of to an institution which was so deserving and so much in need.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) said he was also in a position to know that the work done in Upper Canada College was of an inferior nature. This should be considered before they granted the large sum asked for to this institution. First, let a thorough search be made as to the efficiency of its work. No considerations of its history or its age should suffice to keep it alive. Let them know what is being done there, and have full particulars before they committed themselves to any definite mode of action. If Toronto felt the necessity let its people establish two collegiate institutes, or as many as it educationally required.

Mr. McMAHON was impressed like some of the gentlemen who had spoken of the fact that the usefulness of Upper Canada College as an educational force was gone. He would support the Minister of Education had he brought down a resolution to abolish the college, but to take action to perpetuate it he would never consent. He agreed with all the sentiments expressed concerning the University of Toronto. Only a certain class of the people of Ontario took advantage of Upper Canada College.

Mr. ROBINSON (Cardwell) believed that it would create great dissatisfaction throughout the country if this grant were made to perpetuate this aristocratic institution. Teachers were drawing salaries in this institution nearly double that of grammar school masters who had no greater claims to scholarship or anything else. He hoped the resolution would be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLER would like to say one word in favour of Upper Canada. It was not alone a Provincial institution. There were students from all parts of the world there. He knew that for a fact. The last institution which he would consent to the abolishment of was Upper Canada College.

Mr. CASCADEN could quite understand that many members of the House would stand up in a chivalrous manner for Upper Canada College. But this was the only plea which hon. gentlemen could give for such a defence. Upper Canada compared very unfavourably with many of the existing Collegiate Institutes and High Schools of the Province. He was glad to have heard the remarks that had been dropped by hon. gentlemen concerning the University of Toronto, and would add his voice in favour of granting liberal aid to that most deserving institution.

Mr. BADGEROW was astonished that the Minister of Education had so far misinterpreted the feeling of the country with regard to this question. The University of Toronto must look to the other educational institutions of the country for students, and not to the Upper Canada College. The college had been sustained by a system of plunder.

Mr. CROOKS denied that the remarks of the hon. member were at all applicable to the Upper Canada College.

Mr. BADGEROW did not mean "plundering" in its broad signification, but the word was applicable in a certain sense. He intended to oppose the resolution firmly.

Mr. MEREDITH thought this discussion would do much good. It was a pity that this question had not been placed earlier on the table. The Minister of Education had made an able and courageous defence of the Upper Canada College. Yet still he would advocate the postponement of the present action, and refer the matter to a committee.

Mr. HARCOURT wished to make an explanation. The Minister of Education misunderstood his allusions to Huxley and Tyndall. What he meant to say was that the scientific teaching of such men reached a class of people that classical attainments had no pleasures for. The explanation of the hon. Minister quite changed the question. He was not aware before that the money to be granted for the purposes wanted were to be taken from the funds of the College. This fact entirely changed the complexion of things.

On motion of Mr. Morris the debate was adjourned.

#### PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS SITE.

Mr. CROOKS moved the following resolution:— "That this House doth ratify an Order in Council, dated the first day of March instant, authorizing certain resolutions of the Senate of the University of Toronto, respecting the proposed arrangements between the Province and the Corporation of the city of Toronto, for the erection of the Parliamentary buildings in the Queen's Park. Carried.

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

## ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

### Fourth Parliament—First Session.

The following is the conclusion of Tuesday's proceedings:—

After recess,

The House went into Committee on the Division Court Bill.

Mr. HARDY proposed to make a few amendments to supply some omissions which had inadvertently been made.

Mr. LONG moved in amendment that the Bill be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to insert the following resolution:—"Provided that the jurisdiction of Division Courts be extended to sums not exceeding \$200 in the class of cases in which such Courts have now jurisdiction to the extent of \$100." The mover thought the Bill in its present shape would not meet the wants of a large class of people having business in these Courts. The only reason the legal profession were opposed to the extension of this jurisdiction was because it would lessen their practice in the County Courts.

Mr. MOWAT hoped the House would negative the amendment. The Bill as it was at present went as far as was proposed last year. A good deal of attention had been bestowed upon it, and the Government was strongly of the opinion that it was not desirable that the experiment should be tried to a greater extent than the Bill proposed. He asked the House to bear in mind that in extending this jurisdiction at all they were doing what a number of learned and able men thought was unwise in the interest of suitors in cases where only small sums were involved. He could not say that in thus going against the opinion of so many learned judges that the change was going to work well. At all events it was too much to ask the House to go any further at present than the Bill proposed in this direction. They had opportunity every year to advance further in the matter if they found that an advance was needed. Since the Bill was previously discussed in the House he had received a number of letters from experienced men, giving it as their opinion that cases involving large sums will receive the special attention of the judges, and those involving small sums would be lightly passed over. It was found by experience to be the course which judges unconsciously fell into, and it was only reasonable to suppose that such would be the case to some extent. Upon these grounds, as well as upon others, he would urge upon the House to accept the Bill in the form which they had deliberately considered to be the best form at present.

The amendment was lost on the following division. Yeas, 19; nays, 46:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baskerville, Bell, Boulter, Calvin, Creighton, French, Kerr, Lauder, Long, Meredith, Metcalfe, Morgan, Morris, Near, Parkhill, Richardson, Rosevear, White, Wigle—19.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Cascaden, Chisholm, Deroche, Dryden, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Huron), Gibson (Hamilton), Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Laidlaw, Livingston, McCraney, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, Miller, Mowat, Nairn, Neelon, Pardee, Patterson, Peck, Robinson (Cardwell), Robertson (Halton), Ross, Sinclair, Springer, Striker, Waters, Watterworth, Wood, Young—46.

The original amendments were then concurred in.

#### APPOINTMENT OF GAOLERS.—*Municipal Act*

In the consideration of Mr. Wood's Bill to amend the Municipal Act,

Mr. HARCOURT moved to add a clause to the Bill to the effect that all appointments of gaolers by the sheriff shall require the ratification of the Lieut.-Governor. In rising he asked the indulgence and attention of the House. The matter upon which he wished them to dwell was the relations existing between sheriffs and gaolers. For one thing, there seemed to be no surety as to whom the responsibility of the mismanagement of a gaol rested with. It would be supposed that this would rest on the sheriff, but such was not the case. The gaoler bore the whole onus of anything happening in his gaol. Why not then make the one office totally independent of the other. What generally followed from the connection between sheriff and gaoler was an odious and dangerous system of nepotism. In connection with these the proper system and the best for the interest of our gaols was a plan of promotion by seniority and merit. Mr. Harcourt adduced many instances where the anomalous system at present in vogue was fraught with considerable injustice. Hon. gentlemen could see how a tyrannical sheriff could make the position of the gaoler under him, no matter how faithful and an efficient officer, a quite intolerable one. He hoped that other gentlemen would treat the subject more exhaustively than his strength that night would permit.

Mr. DEROCHE had spoken twice this session on this subject. However, he wished now to endorse the principle enunciated in the amendment to the Municipal Law just read by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HARDY explained that Mr. Harcourt's amendment merely advanced the opinion that the Lieutenant-Governor should coincide in the appointments made by the sheriffs.

Mr. MEREDITH said the amendment practically gave into the hands of the Government the patronage connected with gaols throughout the Province. The Government should be courageous and boldly assert their desire to centralize all the patronage of the Province in their own hands. He would protest against this underhand way of settling the matter.

The clause was adopted.

The following Bills were passed through Committee and reported:—

To abolish priority of and among execution creditors.—The Attorney-General.

To amend the Municipal Act—Mr. Wood.

#### TAXATION AND EXEMPTIONS.

The House went into Committee on Mr. Mowat's Bill respecting municipal taxation and exemp-