

were thus defined:—"The council shall continue to be a body corporate, and may acquire and hold land and personal property for the purposes of the association, and may sell, mortgage, lease or otherwise dispose of the same; and all property, real or personal, heretofore vested in or held by the Agriculture and Arts Association shall continue to be vested in the said association and under the control of the council thereof." The building under discussion originated from the savings of the association when they were holding shows in various parts of the Province. It was erected entirely out of their own funds. The Government had had no control over it. The association had desired to make some improvements in the place, because the Department of Agriculture was moving in there. He remembered when the matter was threshed out in the Public Accounts Committee Mr. Jamieson denied that he was liable for the sum named by Mr. Meredith, and offered the Government at the time the sum that he said he ought to pay. This was not accepted. Since that time Mr. Jamieson had spent a good deal of money on the building. Shortly after this money was expended he spent \$2,000 or \$3,000 in alterations, and in 1892 he spent, as he alleged, some \$7,000 in improving the building, and these improvements, by an arrangement with the Agriculture and Arts Association, were to remain when his lease ended. In consideration of these improvements the rent was reduced when the original lease expired in 1892. Under the arrangement then entered into Mr. Jamieson undertook to heat the building. Formerly the Government did this. Now Mr. Jamieson did it all himself, the Agriculture and Arts Association paying him \$20 a month for six months of the year for heating the portion of the premises used by them. So that really Mr. Jamieson was paying now more than formerly. He now paid \$2,000 cash annually for the use of the building. The Government had no control over the association. Mr. Meredith said the Government were paying interest on the mortgage on the building.

Mr. Meredith—Practically, it is the same thing.

Mr. Dryden—Not at all. The association rented the building for \$2,000 annually, and paid interest annually. The Government was not consulted in the matter. The association was an entirely independent body, as he had shown them. With regard to the \$2,000, which appeared from the public accounts in 1888 as due from the association, and was not found in the accounts of the following year, he found from a record of the minutes of the association that in 1888 a committee of the council of the association was appointed to wait upon the Government and ask that the sum named be remitted, urging as a ground therefor that the association had some years previously advanced \$4,000 for additions to the Agricultural College. A subsequent minute stated that an answer had been received that the amount had been demitted with the consent of the Legislature. Mr. Dryden added that the money expended by the association in connection with the building had been, he believed, with an idea to establishing there a department of veterinary science, which, however, had not been done. As the association therefore reaped no benefit from the additions the council had thought it reasonable to ask this compensation.

Mr. Meredith said the Minister of Agriculture based his remarks mainly on the point that the building belonged to the Agriculture and Arts Association. Surely, he said, the Government must have some control over the property of the association to which it made a grant of \$10,000 a year. If the association in question should go out of existence would the Province have no claim whatever on a building which was valued at some \$60,000? Would it belong to the few gentlemen who constituted the board? Surely not. But if the Government had no control over the Agriculture and Arts Association why was money advanced to it in the first place, and why was the debt subsequently demitted? It seemed to him the whole proceeding was marked by gross mismanagement. The Government appeared to think they could do entirely as they pleased with the property of the Province and that members of the Assembly simply gathered here to register pro forma their decrees.

Mr. A. F. Wood spoke for a moment only on the subject. He said it was evident the transaction had been marked by gross mismanagement and he did not regard the answer of the Minister of Agriculture as at all satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Ross said the main portion of Mr. Meredith's remarks were based entirely on a wrong assumption. The Agriculture and Arts Association was a corporate body which rented a portion of its building to the Government. The Government had no control over the rent charged other tenants, nor over mortgages

placed on the building. The objections urged by Mr. Meredith on this score would apply with equal strength to the affairs of any corporate body or municipality in the Province. Whether or not there had been some delay on the part of the Government in collecting from Mr. Jamieson the amount due from him was one thing. The amount of rent paid by him to the association and the interest paid by the association on a mortgage were entirely different matters. The Government would have their hands full if they undertook to conduct the affairs of every corporation of the Province. Because the Government made an annual grant to the association they were not responsible for its transactions any more than the department of Education because it gave a grant to a High School was responsible for the proceedings of the Trustees of the school.

Mr. Meredith—If this association is dissolved, where does the property go?

Hon. Mr. Fraser—Supposing any association dissolves what becomes of its property?

Mr. Meredith—That is no answer.

Hon. Mr. Fraser—That is the answer in law and in fact.

The order was then passed.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT.

Mr. Tait's bill to amend the municipal act was then taken up, and after a very brief discussion read a second time. The principal changes in the municipal law proposed is the giving power to cities to pay Aldermen. It also changes the regulations regarding questions that may be submitted to the popular vote. Mr. Meredith commented on the importance of the first proposal, and hoped it would be thoroughly debated in the House. Mr. Hardy said some of the proposals went rather far and would have to be carefully considered. The bill was then read a second time, and referred to the Municipal Committee.

PUBLIC AND HIGH SCHOOLS.

Dr. Ryerson moved the second reading of his bill to amend the Public Schools act. The feature of the bill is to abolish High School Boards in cities of over a hundred thousand people, their powers to revert to the Public School Boards. Dr. Ryerson said there was a strong feeling in favor of the step he advocated. Its best

result, he thought, would be the prevention of the present overlapping between the two systems of schools. It was also thought if there was one board there would be more unity of method. It would also decrease expense, some of the special officers of one or other of the boards being rendered unnecessary by the amalgamation. In Hamilton, London, Belleville, Guelph and other cities there were united boards of education, which worked well in every way. It was easy enough under the present law for united boards to separate, but it was impossible for them to unite when separated. The proposed union would be in the interest of both.

Hon. Mr. Ross said he sympathized with the object of Dr. Ryerson's bill, but did not care for its form. He was in favor of the union of the two boards wherever it could be accomplished, but did not want to see the High School Board absorbed by that of the Public School. For many years before he was identified with the Department of Education it had been the policy of that department that unions of these boards should not take place. He was not himself theoretically opposed to such union. That was, however, the policy of the department when he took charge, and he was advised by a good many eminent educationists to continue it. He had watched the effect of union in the cases where it existed in the ten years since he had been at the head of the department, and was now satisfied that what the boards accomplished separately could just as well be accomplished as a united corporation. He would not be averse to an amendment which would admit of union. But he thought they should allow those interested in the different High and Public Schools to settle for themselves whether or not they should work together. Dr. Ryerson's bill did not propose that, but proposed that the High School Board should be absorbed by the Public School Board. That was not the operation of the law in other cases where united boards existed already. The united boards consisted of various elements; the Public School Board simply of Trustees elected by the people. He objected to the absorption of the High School Board. No complaint had been made against it. The two large High Schools erected in the city under its supervision were models for the Province. He had no objection, however, to saying that when next amending the High and Public Schools act he would submit an amendment allowing the two corporations to unite and work together when they chose.