

in which the owners of property had been put to large expense in order to quiet their titles to the property. The legal profession should not be considered. They would be kept busy for the next twenty years in arranging and settling deeds. The hon. Mr. Blake was in favour of this system, and he was glad to see that his hon. friends opposite had so much confidence in that hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MEREDITH did not think it desirable to make any sudden change in the law. In Australia, where the system was in force, the transactions in land were not so numerous as in Ontario. He thought the promoters of this scheme should experiment with the system in this Province. The Legislature could simplify the system at present in vogue by making certain changes in the law relating to real estate. He thought the Attorney-General would be able to submit a bill to the House next session with reference to the matter. A central office in the city of Toronto, through which all titles should pass, he did not think would be suitable to the people of this Province.

Mr. MOWAT was glad that the hon. members had taken the opportunity to give their opinions on this important subject. The question of the quieting of titles had been alluded to, and he knew that sometimes a title was so complicated that it would cost \$500 to quiet it. He had given this matter a good deal of attention, and had examined the clauses of a similar measure adopted in England. A short time ago a deputation had waited upon him with regard to this question. The system was revolutionary so far as it related to transactions in property, and he thought it could not be introduced hastily or till the people were prepared for it. He agreed with the hon. gentleman opposite when he said this system should be optional when introduced. If people owned land and desired to bring it under this system they should be entitled to do so. He was sure it would be of great advantage. It was quite remarkable that an important and extensive reform regarding the transfer of land should come from a new colony like Australia. The system had worked to great advantage in other colonies. The matter was afterwards discussed in England, and he thought the English system was in some respects superior to the Australian system. He had compared very carefully the clauses, and the English Act had some advantages. The subject was first introduced in this country by Mr. Mills at the time he was Minister of the Interior, and probably that Act would have passed and been in operation by this time if there had not been a change of Government. Mr. McCarthy had twice introduced similar bills in the present Government. Mr. Blake was also in favour of it. In view of all this he (Mr. Mowat) thought the time had come to present a measure to this House in order to put the people in a position to know what the Torrens system was, and

HE HAD PREPARED A BILL FOR THAT PURPOSE, which was now in type. He had not, however, been able to discuss the bill in detail with his colleagues, therefore he did not think he would be able to introduce it this session. He hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw his motion. Mr. Ermatinger withdrew his motion, the House consenting.

SUPERANNUATED TEACHERS' FUND.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN moved a return "showing in each and every year since 1871, inclusive, the amount of money paid by the teachers of Ontario into the Superannuated Teachers' Fund; the amount paid out by the Government to superannuated teachers; the amount in each year paid out in excess of the amount paid into said fund; the total amount paid into said fund; the total amount paid out of said fund, and the amount of the balance over the former." He thought this was a question of great importance. The Province last year paid some \$37,000 over the amount paid by teachers in Ontario towards the Superannuation Fund. The system was inaugurated in 1870 under the Sanfield Macdonald Administration at the suggestion of the late Chief Superintendent of Education. The conditions were that every male teacher in the Province was obliged to pay four dollars a year towards the fund, which was transmitted by the County Inspector to the Department. When a teacher became 60 years of age he was then entitled to retire, receiving for each year he had taught the sum of six dollars per annum. This was the only condition upon which the fund was established. Since the fund was established many teachers had drifted to other professions, and the object of Dr. Ryerson had been to keep the teachers in the profession. He was one of those who believed that the teachers were not sufficiently well paid. The following figures showed the growth of the fund:—

	Paid to Teachers.	Paid by Teachers.	Loss.
1871.....	\$ 6,143 68	\$ 5,229 00	\$ 914 68
1872.....	11,944 77	11,083 72	861 05
1873.....	19,037 32	11,990 73	7,046 59*
1874.....	22,910 25	12,976 75	9,933 50
1875.....	25,509 25	12,824 18	13,685 07
1876.....	31,768 82	12,767 25	19,001 57
1877.....	35,485 35	14,403 25	21,082 10*
1878.....	41,318 95	13,767 12	27,551 83*
1879.....	43,774 50	16,217 93	27,556 57*
1880.....	42,396 00	15,816 45	26,579 55
1881.....	54,962 56	14,195 75	40,764 81
1882.....	51,000 00	13,501 08	37,598 92
1883.....	51,474 59	12,515 50	39,959 05
Totals..	\$ 438,736 24	\$ 167,390 71	\$ 272,335 53

It was evident to the House that this fund

is assuming a magnitude demanding serious consideration, and there should be something done to prevent its further increase. There was not a civil servant in the Province or a teacher in the Province, who was there from sheer patriotism, and the maintenance of such a system was an anomaly on this continent outside the Dominion. No one of the United States had any such a system. It was evident to all that something must be done. He would not advocate anything which would interfere with the enjoyment of those who had joined the fund in good faith, but in future the door must be shut. He well remembered the outcry raised by teachers against the scheme, and they claimed as men of intelligence to be able to invest their funds for themselves, and so if the system was ended there could be no dissatisfaction. He concluded by urging the matter on the serious consideration of the Minister of Education.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex) said there would be no objection to the return being brought down, and he was pleased that the member had introduced the subject, and he might say that he intended to bring the matter before the profession and the country during recess in order that he might have opinion on the subject. The object of the fund had been to assist the teachers who were regarded as having low salaries and being public benefactors, spending their strength for their country rather than for their own interests. He thought it was a mistake to make the teacher in any sense a civil servant. In addressing himself to the question of abolishing the fund, he was opposed by many difficulties, while if it had to be made self-sustaining the payment would have to be greatly increased. At present the teachers paid \$4 a year and it would be needful to increase it at once to \$16, and in the near future it would have to be raised to \$20. If they considered the problem of abolishing the fund they would have to continue the payments to the present claimants on the fund and repay to those who were deprived of prospective benefits the amount of their contributions. This would involve a payment of at least \$100,000.

Mr. MEREDITH asked if the Minister of Education could give the amount withdrawn from the fund.

Mr. ROSS said the total amount withdrawn was \$23,586, and there now stands to the credit of the teachers the sum of \$140,000, but as many had left the country, some had left the profession, and others would not claim their payments, he thought that \$100,000 would meet the claims of those not on the fund. He thought that the present outgo would not be diminished for a time, but as many of the claimants were over 60 years of age, after about ten years there would be a rapid diminution. He was not prepared at the present time to suggest a scheme or say what would be the best course to pursue, but he thought they might be doing the teachers some injustice by continuing the present state of things. It was now looked on as a position of dependence, and perhaps an increase of salary was desired consequent upon trustees looking upon the fund as a solatum for a poor salary, and their advancement was thereby retarded.

Mr. MEREDITH quite concurred in the remark that there was no need for grafting upon our system that of superannuation. He quite agreed with the Minister of Education that the resources of the Province should not be taxed for the continuance of the fund. He concluded by speaking against the system of gratuities as being something liable to abuse.

Mr. MOWAT thought the system of gratuities had grown up from the analogous system of parsimony existing at Ottawa. He was quite certain that if it were not for the gratuities many of the old servants of the Government would be left without a cent in the world. The same was true of the teachers, and he was quite sure that but for the allowance many of them would be in a starving condition. He concluded by hoping that some conclusion would be reached satisfactory to the teachers and the Province.

Mr. MEREDITH—What did they do before the fund was established?

Mr. MOWAT replied that they were in great straits. It would be a most lamentable thing to contemplate if men who had spent their lives in such an important and honourable profession should be in want in their old age, and die of starvation. He would be glad if some scheme could be formulated by which the end could be attained, and the Province eased from the large and increasing burden.

Mr. HARCOURT suggested that the words should be added to the motion, "and the amount paid out to teachers who have withdrawn from the fund during the same period." This sum, he thought, was increasing, and was conclusive evidence against the popularity of the fund. He thought that if a circular were issued to the teachers it would be found that they were against the continuance of the fund.

The motion was carried.

PUBLIC BILLS.

The House went into Committee and reported the following bills:—

To amend the Act to impose a tax on dogs, and for the protection of sheep.—Mr. Chisholm. To amend the Ontario Tree Planting Act, 1883.—Mr. Monk. To amend the Mechanics' Lien Act.—Mr. Ermatinger. To amend the Division Courts Act.—Mr. Lees. To amend the Ontario Drainage Act.—Mr. Balfour.

FIRST READINGS.

Mr. MEREDITH introduced a bill to amend the County Courts Act.