

he said, gave visitors a bad impression of Canada, and caused the park to compare unfavorably with that on the other side.

The Attorney-General said the only other way of raising the money necessary to the expenses of the park would be by a grant of the House. He did not think this would be acceptable to the Province generally. The principal portion of the park was free now, though a charge was made for it under the old system. The commissioners were not making money for themselves. In fact, they received even no pay for their services. The fees were charged only for the benefit of the Province. Mr. McCleary had himself said the State of New York had expended millions of dollars on its park. The Ontario park had not cost the Province a thousand dollars, he thought.

The bill was then read a second time.

BOARD OF TRADE.

The Attorney-General moved the second reading of his bill to enable Boards of Trade in cities to appoint general arbitrators for certain purposes. The bill provides that the Council of the Board of Trade shall nominate from the community generally not less than 30 persons who have given their consent to act as arbitrators for the settlement of disputes between the members of the board, and that of this number there shall be elected by ballot whatever number the council may determine as necessary for a Chamber of Arbitration. This bill had arisen from very strong representations made by the Board of Trade, said the Attorney-General. It would effect a great saving of time and money. The principle was entirely voluntary, and at present the bill was confined to Toronto, though it could be extended to other cities of over 30,000 population if they desired. It was not necessary arbitrators should be members of the Board of Trade.

Mr. Meredith did not think the bill would do much harm or good. It contained little that was new, and gave the board little advantage in connection with arbitration that it had not before.

BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS.

The Attorney-General then moved the second reading of his bill respecting the call of solicitors to the bar, the leading feature of which is to enable solicitors to become barristers after practising ten years without undergoing any examination, and at the end of five years with an examination and a fee lower than that now charged.

Mr. Meredith emphatically protested against the bill, and considered it remarkable that it should emanate from the leader of the bar of Ontario and a member of the Benchers. It was a direct slap in the face to the Law Society. The Attorney-General proposed putting the man who had gone to much study and expense to secure the barristers' degree on the same footing as those who had not considered it worth their while to do so. He held that the Law Society had done its duty, that the fees asked were not unreasonable, and that the Attorney-General in this bill was not treating them fairly. There was no agitation for the legislation.

Mr. Balfour, who said an ordinary layman must needs discuss such a subject with fear and trembling, said the Attorney-General no doubt felt he was there not to represent the Law Society but the community generally. He understood the differences between the two classes of the profession were of an arbitrary character, but he knew nothing of the details. The House, however, had full control over the action of the Law Society, and there was no reason why it should not exercise its authority if it saw fit. There were many solicitors through the country who felt it a heavy tax to pay the fees demanded and to undergo the necessary examinations. To these the bill would be a great benefit. He thought the bill would be approved through the country and by many members even of the Law Society.

Mr. Whitney said Mr. Balfour's arguments showed he knew little of the real facts of the case. He had no serious objection to the bill, though he found fault with some details.

The Attorney-General said he had discharged his duty as a Benchers years ago with great satisfaction and pleasure. He was confident the Law Society would acquit him of any discourtesy in bringing in this bill. He and his colleagues were opposed to private acts to accomplish what this general act proposed. The House had frequently legislated in regard to the Law Society and there had been no trouble. His reason for taking up the subject was because he believed there was a widespread feeling that the two branches of the profession should be amalgamated. He did not wish to go so far as this, but thought the House could safely go as far as the present bill proposed.

Mr. Meredith said he wanted to make it clear that he did not pretend to be speaking for the Law Society.

The Attorney-General said "No," he

thought the Law Society would not sanction Mr. Meredith's remarks.

The bill was then read a second time, and, it being 6 o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

When the House met after dinner it went immediately into Committee of Supply. The estimates of the Education Department were taken up and the items under the head of Normal and Model Schools were considered. Considerable discussion occurred on the general question of allowances to retiring officials. Mr. Meredith and Dr. Ryerson contended that the Minister of Education showed favoritism, Dr. Ryerson mentioning the names of a number whom he alleged to have been unfairly treated. He said the principle of retiring allowances appeared to be that those who were dismissed received the allowances, and those who retired voluntarily received none. Hon. Mr. Ross emphatically repudiated the insinuation, ran over the names cited by Dr. Ryerson, and showed each person had been fairly treated. The case of Miss Hagarty having been mentioned, Mr. Ross went very fully into the case. He stated that Miss Hagarty had been retained as long as her usefulness remained, longer in fact. When her resignation was at length requested it had become absolutely necessary in the interests of the department. She had been treated with great forbearance. The first inkling he had of Miss Hagarty's politics was from a confidential letter that was sent to The Mail newspaper and inadvertently published. The letter complained of the treatment she was receiving, and begged The Mail to take it up editorially. He had asked Miss Hagarty to come into his office, and she had there admitted writing the letter, and said she was sorry it was published. He had told her she ought to be sorry she had written it. He had added that if the letter had been written by a man the writer would have been immediately dismissed. As it was, he simply directed her to return to her room and resume her work. He heard no more from her directly, but the matter had been agitated by his political opponents. Mr. Ross quoted from letters written by officers of the department declaring Miss Hagarty to be not well adapted for the position she had been filling. The forbearance shown for so many years, the Minister thought, showed the reverse of the autocratic behavior with which he was charged by the Opposition.

Mr. Meredith thought that the dates of the documents quoted showed that the Minister was in the habit of striking the blow and then securing the documents. He took action first, and then asked for the report. The Minister had admitted that he had refused an investigation. Mr. Meredith then read testimonials from Principal Kirkland, Dr. McLellan, Dr. Davies and others, of Miss Hagarty's abilities; and on the Minister's informing him that these certificates were given two years after Miss Hagarty's dismissal, replied that it was very wrong of these gentlemen to utter such favorable opinions of a teacher against whom they had reported. The Minister should not have blasted a teacher's reputation on such grounds.

Hon. Mr. Hardy remarked that the doctrine held by the Opposition was that a teacher, once appointed, owned the school, his or her superiors, and the Minister, in fee simple, and was not to be disturbed on any pretence. The testimonials read by Mr. Meredith were undated, and he had declined to give the dates; there was an excellent reason for this; but, in any case, it was well known that testimonials are to a very large extent complimentary. He also pointed out that the terms of several of the testimonials cited gave Miss Hagarty credit for powers and abilities which all admit she has, but were silent upon her weak points. Mr. Hardy then reviewed the history of the case, holding that Miss Hagarty's persistence in refusing to submit to discipline was ample justification for the Minister's action in dismissing her.

Dr. Ryerson spoke on the subject, saying that he thought that there was considerable feeling excited through the country on account of the system of retiring gratuities.

Mr. Whitney thought that Hon. Mr. Hardy had been unduly bitter in his remarks about Miss Hagarty, and reminded him that, while acting Minister of Education, he had temporarily promoted Miss Hagarty.

Hon. Mr. Hardy pointed out that that had been during Mrs. Cullen's tenure of the principalship, and that he had simply given the second teacher the temporary care of the school when Mrs. Cullen was ill.

Mr. Clancy said that he hoped that no teachers at present on the staff were fitting themselves for other professions.

Hon. Mr. Ross pointed out that it is a general thing for teachers to pursue such studies; he did not, as a rule, like the teachers at the school to be so distracted, but he could not make an absolute rule.

The other items in the Education Department were passed without serious dis-