

Crown Attorney. This, however, was a minor part of the bill. His great objection to the bill lay in the other matters to which he had referred. In view of the punishment provided under the existing law, he must ask the House to reject the bill.

Mr. Meredith drew attention to the fact that the bill had been upon the paper for some time, and therefore, if there was anything in the bill which was deserving of consideration, he thought it was the duty of the House to take the matter in hand and deal with it. He regretted that the Attorney-General had not seen his way to consent to what his hon. friend proposed, and to make an experiment at all vents, and to provide for the punishment by imprisonment of the person who gave the bribes. A great deal might be said on behalf of the man who took a bribe, but there was nothing to be said on behalf of those who systematically set themselves to debauch an electorate, and he thought it was the duty of the House to show their disapprobation of such practices by passing this provision. This offence was considered a venial offence. It was not considered a serious offence, and unless it was stamped with some disgrace it would always be regarded as a venial offence. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to read to the House some letters which he described as evidence that came out at an election trial where the Attorney-General of the Province had actually, he said, induced a man to abandon the trial instead of proceeding with it, showing that the Attorney-General looked upon an offence of this kind as venial. Mr. Hickey applied for the position of License Inspector for South Renfrew, and he sought to disqualify Dr. Dowling, who was member for the constituency, and the Attorney-General, as the correspondence showed, induced him to let Dr. Dowling go.

The Attorney-General said he was not aware that the charge was one of bribery. It might have been a hundred things to which the letter referred.

Mr. Meredith said the letters were produced at the trial, and no doubt the Attorney-General would be able to fill up the blanks, for only some of them were produced.

Mr. Murray had some recollection of the trial. He believed this man thought he could make certain disclosures, but he (Mr. Murray) had no doubt he was encouraged to make them.

The division then took place with the following result:—

YEAS.—Balfour, Clancy, Clarke, H. E. (Toronto), Craig, Creighton, Cruess, French, Hammell, Hess, Hudson, Ingram, Kerns, Lees, Mack, Marter, Meacham, Meredith, Metcalfe, Miller, Monk, Morgan, Ostrom, Preston, Rorke, Tooley, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Hastings), Wylie—30.

NAYS.—Allan, Armstrong, Awroy, Ballantyne, Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Conmee, Dack, Dance, Davis, Drury, Dryden, Evanturel, Ferguson, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Garson, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Gould, Graham, Guthrie, Harcourt, Hardy, Leys, Lyon, McAndrew, McKay, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mackenzie, Master, Morin, Mowat, Murray, O'Connor, Phelps, Rayside, Robillard, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Smith (York), Snider, Sprague, Stratton, Waters, Wood (Brant)—52.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. Creighton then moved the second reading of his bill to amend the Act respecting the Department of Education. It proposed the repeal of subsection 2 of section 7 of the Act, and substitute the following:—

"No such regulation or Order in Council shall have any force or effect until it shall be approved of by the Legislative Assembly, and, if so approved, the same shall be printed and bound up with the statutes of the year."

This section originally read as follows:—

"In case the Legislative Assembly at the said session, or if the session does not continue for three weeks after the said regulation or Order in Council is laid before the House, then, at the ensuing session of the Legislature, disapproves by resolution of such regulation or Order in Council either wholly or of any part thereof, the regulation or Order in Council, so far as disapproved of, shall have no effect from the time of such resolution being passed."

Mr. Creighton spoke briefly in support of his bill.

The Minister of Education said this bill was one of those little fads that could hardly have originated anywhere but in the profound brain of the member for North Grey. No changes in the regulations were made, but they were duly reported to the House subsequently, and none of them were made at all unless they had been previously submitted to and approved by various deliberative bodies, such as the Teachers' Associations, etc. They were

also always considered by the officers of the Department. He cited many instances of regulations, many of them of great importance, that were entirely under the control of the various Departments of Government service at Ottawa, and in the various other departments of the service here. It was not fair to tie the hands of the Department of Education as they would be tied if every detail of the regulations had to be brought before the House. Moreover, comparatively few changes were made in the regulations. Under these circumstances he must ask the House to reject the bill.

Mr. Meredith said Mr. Creighton's bill was simply carrying to its legitimate end the resolution of the House when it determined to take the Department of Education under its control. If the House had been made aware of the various regulations issued by the Department in respect to the French Schools in the East of the Province the conditions that had arisen there would never have been brought about. During the past year the Department had instituted a system of bi-lingual teaching at an expense, concerning which the House had been told and knew nothing. The House should have been consulted here. There were other amendments to the High School system which should have been first brought before the House. It was not right to leave such power in the hands of the Department.

The Attorney-General said Mr. Meredith did not deny that a host of regulations were made in the Departments, both here and at Ottawa, as Mr. Ross had pointed out, similar to those of the Department of Education, yet it was the Department of Education alone that he preferred to move against. He seemed to forget that the Government was a responsible body elected by the people and that these regulations were made by this Government or by officers appointed by this Government. Such regulations had the same effect as if they had been made in the House itself, and had just as much force and just as much the confidence of the country which had placed the Government in power. (Applause.) As regarded these school regulations, the system he now condemned was one that had always prevailed, even when the Education Department was not in any way a responsible body. When it was considered that the same system prevailed everywhere under popular responsible government it was evident that there was no reason to make any change. It was not even now contended that there had been any abuse of this power. The regulations had always been reported to the House, and they had been so good that the Opposition had been unable to find any fault or flaw in them. Under the circumstances the House could not accept the bill.

Mr. Meredith called for a division, which resulted as follows:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Biggar, Blyth, Clancy, Clarke, H. E. (Toronto), Craig, Creighton, Cruess, French, Hammell, Hess, Hudson, Ingram, Kerns, Leys, Marter, Meacham, Meredith, Metcalfe, Miller, Monk, Morgan, Ostrom, Preston, Rorke, Smith (York), Stewart, Tooley, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Hastings), Wylie—31.

NAYS.—Messrs. Allan, Armstrong, Awroy, Balfour, Ballantyne, Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Conmee, Dack, Dance, Davis, Drury, Dryden, Evanturel, Ferguson, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Garson, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Gould, Graham, Guthrie, Harcourt, Hardy, Leys, Lyon, McAndrew, McKay, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mackenzie, Master, Morin, Mowat, Murray, O'Connor, Phelps, Rayside, Robillard, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Smith (York), Snider, Sprague, Stratton, Waters, Wood (Brant)—54.

THE MANHOOD SUFFRAGE ACT.

Mr. Meacham moved the second reading of his bill to amend the Manhood Suffrage Act. The provisions of the bill were as follows:—

(1) Section 3 of the Manhood Suffrage Act is amended by striking out the word "Province" in the eighth line thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Dominion," and by inserting after the word "aforesaid" in the eighteenth line of said section the words, "for beginning to make said roll or for making such complaint as the case may be."

(2) Section 10 of the said Act is hereby amended by adding as sub-section 2 the following:—

(2nd.) But no person shall be entitled to have his name entered upon the assessment roll under the Manhood Suffrage Act, whose age is given at 22 or under, and whose name does not appear on the voters' lists for the previous year, without delivering or causing to be delivered to the assessor an affidavit signed by himself in the form or to the effect set forth in Form A appended to chapter 5, of the Acts passed in the fifty-second year of Her Majesty's reign, or an affidavit signed by one of his parents on his behalf in the form or to the effect set forth in Form A, appended to this Act.

Hon. Mr. Fraser said Mr. Meacham had made out no case at all for the bill. Under the next clause thereof he would give a vote for the Legislature to a man who had resided anywhere in the Dominion and came into the Province the day before the election.

Mr. Meacham—Why not?

Mr. Fraser—Because it would result in the colonisation of every close constituency