

ject. If they left to land surveyors the power to govern themselves, the land surveyors would not abuse the power.

Mr. Hardy, in reply to the objections raised, said the surveyors had insisted upon the preservation of the connection between themselves and the Crown Lands Department and the Government. They had drafted the clause of the bill giving the Government power to appoint two members of the examining board, and they had insisted upon it remaining in the bill. They had also inserted a provision providing that the Government should appoint members of the general council, but this clause had been eliminated. Heretofore the Government had appointed the whole board and had paid them. He saw then no objection to the Government appointing two of the board as in the proposed bill. As for the remarks of Mr. Cleland, they at first seemed to have some force, but on examination they appeared to be less forcible. Mr. Cleland asks Who is to compel the surveyor to accept an apprentice? Why this bill is merely a continuing of the present law on that point. The bill does not make any change in the present law. There had been no difficulty of that sort in the past, and he saw no reason to think there would be greater difficulty in the future. However well it might sound, the argument was a fallacy. A young man wishing to become a lawyer had to serve as an apprentice for three or five years, but he never heard that a lawyer had refused to take a student. Mr. Balfour had objected on general principles, but the bill does not make the surveyors a close corporation. He was not prepared to say whether the fee should be lowered until they had a conference with the surveyors. The bill gives the surveyors no power they did not have before, and contains nothing prejudicial to the public interest. The bill was drawn up with so much prudence, moderation and regard for the public that many of the objections which had been raised to similar bills last year would not be found in this one.

Mr. Clancy did not find fault with the principle of the bill, but thought there were some extraordinary powers proposed to be granted, especially with regard to fees. The land surveyors should be as free in working out their incorporation as the medical men or any other profession. He thought the Government should not be represented on the board at all.

Mr. Waters found no very great objection to the principle of the bill, which simply extended the power they now had. But he thought the fees should be made subject to revision by the Commissioner of Crown Lands.

The bill was then read a second time.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. Hardy moved the second reading of the bill to consolidate the acts respecting municipal institutions. He said it was merely a consolidation or compilation. When they came to clauses 569 to 611 they would substitute new clauses containing a consolidation of the act of last year relating to drainage arbitration, without waiting for the report of the Drainage Commission. The bill was then read a second time.

LANDS LEFT TO CHARITY.

Mr. Mowat moved the second reading of the bill to amend the law relating to mortmain and charitable uses. In explaining this measure Mr. Mowat pointed out it was to remedy the mistake often made by testators in leaving real estate instead of personal property to charitable institutions or societies. The bill provided that such property might be sold at once by the executors for the benefit of the charity named. A similar law was recently enacted by the British Parliament, and he believed it was a wise and fair arrangement, while guarding against charitable corporations holding a large amount of real property.

Mr. H. E. Clarke pointed out that a year was named as the limit in which such sale should take place. This, he thought, might

be a hardship in some cases. In Toronto, for instance, real estate was at present slightly depressed, and to order an immediate sale might mean a sacrifice in value.

The bill was read a second time.

THE ESTIMATES.

The House then went into committee of supply on the estimates, and the following amounts were passed:—Government House, \$1,950; Lieut.-Governor's office, \$3,980; Executive Council and Attorney-General's Department, \$18,300; Department of Education, \$19,150; Department of Crown Lands, \$57,100; Department of Public Works, \$20,900; Treasury Department, \$21,145; license branch of Treasury Department, first officer, \$1,900; Provincial inspector and accountant, \$1,400.

During the discussion Messrs. Clancy and A. F. Wood (Hastings) brought up the subject of salaries of public servants, urging that some system for granting increases should be adopted.

Mr. Ross replied, pointing out that the heads of the various departments exercised every discretion in this matter, and increases were made not always for lengthened services but for the class of work performed. The adoption of the Civil Service Act would be easier for the Government, as it would often relieve them from responsibility and trouble, but he believed the present system was in the best interests of the Province.

The debate was continued by Messrs. White, H. E. Clarke and Whitney.

Mr. Hardy further pointed out that in making increases the peculiar fitness of each official was taken into consideration. In some instances the duties of officials called for a good deal of ability and mental exertion, while in other cases the work was of a routine character. To increase both at the same ratio would be manifestly unfair.

INSPECTOR OF LICENSES.

On the item of \$1,750 for the Provincial inspector of licenses (heretofore paid out of Scott Act appropriation) objection was raised by the Opposition to the increase of \$350 in the salary.

The appointment and the increase were strongly defended by Mr. Harcourt. Mr. Stewart, he said, was one of the most popular citizens of Ottawa, as was evidenced by the heartiness of the address and presentation on his leaving Ottawa. This was participated in by all classes of the community and was entirely irrespective of political differences. Mr. Stewart had also been a prominent temperance worker and enjoyed the confidence of the temperance people. The appointment had been made because the Government desired to secure the best possible man for the position, and under all the circumstances the advance made in the remuneration was fair and equitable.

Mr. Bronson said he was personally acquainted with Mr. Stewart and could bear testimony to his fitness for the position. Mr. Stewart had not sought the office and he (Mr. Bronson) had urged him not to accept it, knowing what a useful and valuable citizen he was to Ottawa. He could not, therefore, be accused of having influenced the appointment.

Mr. McLenaghan said that he thought the inspector had not, as had been claimed, given up a lucrative business to take the position. His business was not always successful.

Mr. Hardy replied, giving the last speaker a rather warm castigation for making a charge against an official on account of a supposed business difficulty ten or fifteen years ago. The inspector was a man of grit, of energy and of mental and physical activity, and these qualifications had entitled him, in the opinion of the Government, to the increase.

Mr. White thought that the fact of Mr. Stewart having been identified with the temperance movement did not make out a case. The committee rose and reported progress.

Before adjournment Hon. Mr. Hardy, in