

as that now practised. Dr. Meacham accordingly withdrew the bill.

Mr. Dynes' bill to amend the jurors act came next. He explained that it was intended to substitute in the summoning of jurymen service by registered letter instead of by personal service. Hon. Mr. Hardy, while sympathizing with all movements towards economy, thought that in all matters relating to the administration of justice exactness and precision were needed. The jurors might or might not receive the letter and delay might be caused. He thought the bill had better be withdrawn.

Mr. Dynes was rather unwilling to do this, and Mr. Haycock urged that the bill be sent to the Legal Committee. Sir Oliver Mowat observed that the suggestion was entirely novel, and that it was important that there should be some means of enforcing attendance at courts by jurors. Mr. Dynes finally withdrew the bill.

THE MEDICAL BILL.

Mr. Haycock's bill to amend the medical act by cutting in half the fees charged students by the Ontario Medical Council came up next. The bill stipulated that fees for all examinations and registration be not more than \$50. Mr. Haycock stated that the fee now is \$100, and that the financial statements of the Medical Association showed that in the last five years \$51,732 had been received from medical students for fees, while the cost in that period of the examinations had been \$14,592, a profit of over \$37,000 made out of the students. At the rate of \$50 per student there would still have been \$12,000 profit. The surplus, Mr. Haycock said, had been invested in unprofitable real estate in Toronto.

Dr. McKay of Oxford defended the Medical Association, claiming that Mr. Haycock had not made out a case for his bill. This would be the third or fourth funeral of this proposition, he said. This bill had not been asked for by a single resolution of medical students, in whose behalf it was supposed to be introduced. He granted that there was a revenue received from students' fees, but the mere examination was not the only service rendered to students by the council. For one thing, the building was an absolute necessity, it being an absolute impossibility to find in Toronto a hall large enough for the examinations. When he had been examiner he had a class of 250, who found the Orange Hall altogether too small for a fair examination. Then there had to be scientific apparatus of all descriptions for the examination of the students, and that had cost anywhere from \$5,000 to \$7,000. Dr. McKay then compared the fees with those charged in Britain to show that the fees here are smaller than those charged there, and remarked that law students in Ontario have to pay \$210 in fees. The medical profession had never asked for help from the Province's funds since Confederation, and it should not be interfered with now.

After a brief rejoinder from Mr. Haycock, Hon. Mr. Ross spoke in opposition to the bill. It proposed to deal, he said, with an educational organization which had done splendid work for Ontario in the past twenty years. He was not an advocate of close corporations, but would not be deterred by that term from helping an institution which had done such good service, and there was in the constitution of the Medical Association nothing to deter any young man from entering upon the study of medicine. Continuing, Mr. Ross urged the importance of keeping up the high standard of medical education. It was more important that a high standard of professional efficiency should be maintained in the medical profession than that now and then one or two young men should be kept out. After touching on the public service rendered by having competent officers, Mr. Ross analyzed the expenditure of the association, contending that it was perfectly justifiable and in the interests of the profession. The Province must be kept clear of quacks, he said, and the profession should be left to manage its own affairs.

Mr. Haycock would not consent to withdraw his bill, and it was accordingly declared lost on division.

EVENING SESSION.

On reassembling, the House went into committee and passed the following bills with a few minor amendments:—

Mr. Barr—To amend the act to incorporate the Pembroke Southern Railway Co.

Mr. Robertson—To amend the act to incorporate the Grand Valley Railway Company.

Mr. Magwood—Respecting the railway debenture debt of the Township of Mornington.

Mr. Richardson—Respecting the floating debt of the Village of East Toronto.

Mr. Magwood—Respecting the railway debenture debt of the Township of Elma.

Mr. Stratton—Respecting the Town of Peterboro'.

Mr. Stratton—To amend the acts relating to the Land Security Company.

Mr. Kerns—To enable the trustees of the congregation of Knox Church, Acton, to sell certain lands in the Village of Acton.

The following private bills were given their second reading:—

Mr. Chapple—To incorporate the Village of Port Carling.

Mr. Hobbs—Respecting the City of London.

Mr. German—Respecting the London Street Railway Company.

Mr. Hiscott—To incorporate the Lincoln Radial Electric Railway Company.

Mr. Blezard—To amend the act incorporating the Ontario, Belmont & Northern Railway Co.

Mr. Garrow—To enable Thomas Henry Lewis to practise dentistry.

Mr. O'Keefe—Respecting the City of Ottawa.

Mr. Harcourt—To authorize the commissioners of the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park to grant certain lands to the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.

Mr. Crawford—Respecting the City of Toronto.

A PATRON BILL.

Reverting again to public bills, Mr. Gamey moved the second reading of his bill to amend the election act. The bill provided that no Sheriff, County Crown Attorney, Clerk of the Peace, Registrar of Deeds or other Government official shall take active part in an election, the penalty being a fine not to exceed \$200. Mr. Gamey made a vigorous speech in behalf of his bill, saying he had very strong views on the subject in view of what he had seen in the last election.

Mr. Stratton followed Mr. Gamey, saying that the bill, if passed, would deprive a number of men from taking part in an election who did not deserve to be subjected to such a deprivation. He had no doubt his hon. friend had had the support of many officials, both Dominion and Ontario, yet he made no objection to it. He did not think this Legislature had any right to say that those men should not take part in an election. If any of those officials had taken part in election campaigns they must have been strong partizans.

Mr. McDonald spoke briefly, saying that the bill was a step in the right direction.

Mr. Howland thought the House should spend a little more time in discussing the matter, as they had gone too fast sometimes; bills often were passed with what he considered undue precipitation. Passing on, he expressed pleasure at hearing the member for Peterboro' (Mr. Stratton) admit that there was political work done by Government officials. The influence of a Sheriff, who asked a voter to vote "right," was very strong, and he was an officer capable of exercising a serious degree of compulsion. Those officials, he contended, were generally strong partizans when they were appointed, and for that reason he thought they should be prohibited from taking part in elections. This, the pioneer Province, Mr. Howland concluded, should be first in taking that step towards reform in elections.

Mr. German thought Mr. Howland had not taken a very close scrutiny of the law, as by the Ontario statutes all those officials enumerated in the proposed bill were disqualified from voting, and his experience was that a man who could not vote did not take much interest in an election. The hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. German thought, should bend their energies towards remedying a worse state of affairs in Dominion politics, as the members of the Opposition were supporters of the Dominion Government.

Mr. Howland—I don't know what the hon. gentleman means by saying we support the Dominion Government.

Mr. German—I am glad to see that there is another bolter from the Conservative party. In concluding, Mr. German said that the Sheriffs of this country would jeopardize their position by taking part in the elections contrary to the statute, and he had not known any of the officials mentioned in the bill to take part in elections in his constituency.

Mr. St. John said that the previous