

over fisheries in inland waters was any announcement made by the Government to refrain from interfering with persons offering fish for sale, and if so, how, when and to whom, and has any return of moneys realized from sales of fish been made by any officer of the Government?

Mr. Hardy replied that no general instruction had been given. In correspondence from time to time relating to this matter officers had been advised that the law would practically remain as it had been hitherto construed until the decision of the Privy Council had been rendered. Some remonstrance had been made with the officer at Uxbridge who was said to have made an illegal seizure. He had no return of any money received.

SEIZURE AT UXBRIDGE.

The leader of the Opposition then moved for the correspondence between the Government and any person or persons relating to the seizure and sale of a quantity of fish in the possession of a woman named Godfrey (or Lebar) at Uxbridge by one Matthew Frankish during February, 1897.

In explanation he said that he had been informed that on February 15 at Uxbridge, Frankish, an officer of the Government, had seized the Lake Simcoe fish which were being offered for sale by a poor woman named Godfrey, whose husband was said to be blind. He had sold the fish by auction and put the proceeds in his pocket. While he was selling them he was told that, pending the decision of the appeal as to the right to control the fisheries, Mr. Hardy had announced that the Provincial officers would not interfere with the sale of fish, and Mr. Mulock had made a similar announcement on behalf of the Dominion Government. A week before William Martin had 650 pounds of Lake Simcoe fish seized and sold by an Ontario Government officer in Lindsay. The officer at Uxbridge had announced that if he came to that town he would see him through. On the day that Mrs. Godfrey's fish were seized fish were exposed in three different shops in the town, but Frankish did not interfere. On February 16 Lake Simcoe fish were offered for sale, and the officer made no seizure.

Mr. Hardy read to the House a letter that Game Warden Tinsley had written to Frankish. It was as follows:— "Complaints have reached me of high-handed proceedings by you in Uxbridge recently. I shall be glad to hear any explanation that may justify your conduct in seizing, confiscating and disposing of fish, the property of a poor woman, without acting in accordance with the statutes. In the event of your not being able to justify your conduct you had better return your badge to this office, as the commission cannot afford to keep men on the staff of deputy wardens that act as unjudiciously as you appear to have done."

Mr. Hardy hazarded the opinion that the seizure might have been made on the ground that the fish being offered for sale were out of season. As to this point, however, he had no information.

SPECIALISTS' CERTIFICATES.

Col. Matheson moved for a return giving the names of all High School teachers who have received specialists' certificates since 1885 as the result of examinations. The names of such teachers who received specialists' certificates on any other ground, stating the year in which such certificate was granted, on what grounds and the University standing of the recipient, and names of all applicants for such certificates who have been refused them and on what grounds such refusal was based.

Col. Matheson said that there was general dissatisfaction among the High School teachers of the Province as to the methods adopted at the School of Pedagogy. The fact that University-trained men were plucked on the ground that their methods of teaching were not such as to satisfy the examiners was regarded by Col. Matheson as a proof that something was wrong. The consensus of opinion was, he said, that there was no necessity for such a school for men who had passed through a University. Examiners had plucked candidates whose University standing was superior to theirs. It was a question as to whether political influence had not secured men certificates when their ability failed to obtain them. Col. Matheson asserted that a system of terrorism had been ex-

ercised by the head of the department over the teachers of the Province.

THE MINISTER REPLIES.

Mr. Ross, in replying to the remarks of Col. Matheson, assured him that he did not fear any scrutiny that he could set on foot. If he chose to proceed to substantiate his charge of terrorism, the Minister said, he could bring some of those who had been terrorized here and ascertain what they had to say. Col. Matheson had been unwittingly imposed upon. His intentions as a member of the House and as one interested in education were good, but he had perhaps met some candidate, maybe an honor graduate or some person for whom the task of the School of Pedagogy was rather severe, and who, having gone before the examiners, had poured his troubles into the member's ears. Such complaints had been made in regard to the Law School and medical examinations, with which he (Mr. Ross) had nothing to do. The examination at the Normal College, he said, was intended to serve a useful purpose, which was to prevent High Schools coming into the hands of men who, perhaps without experience or training, might draw considerable salaries and not give the best value for them. The objections now raised to the Normal College were similar to those formerly urged against the Normal School. The Normal School had justified its existence, and its usefulness was universally recognized. The system of Normal School training had grown broader in the last few years, and the method of teaching had undergone a radical change. Mr. Ross held that if the argument in favor of the Normal School training of Public School teachers was a good one it applied with greater force to the training of night school teachers. He fortified his contention by quoting the opinions of some of the foremost educationists in the United States, Great Britain and Germany. He denied that it was true that all the High School teachers complained of the system. Those, he said, who were teachers could not complain; perhaps those who were seeking to be teachers complained. Mr. Ross characterized as absurd the charge that political influence was exerted in behalf of some candidates, and that terrorism was exercised by himself.

Mr. Whitney held that the great difficulty, the radical sore in the whole matter, was that instead of attempting to impart education in its proper sense, that was lost sight of in an effort to turn out as many certificated people as possible and to point to them as the results. As to terrorism, of which he knew little as yet, he wished to point out a fact which had been recalled to his memory by the discussion, that is that a certain letter written on a certain day to a certain newspaper in this city was published twelve or fourteen days afterwards, and that there was strong inferential proof that it was seen by someone in the Education Department in the interval.

Mr. Ross—Not so.

Mr. Whitney continued that he was glad to hear Mr. Ross give the information so readily, and hoped all other information would be given as readily. He had no proof that the letter had been seen, but had inferred that such was the case.

Mr. Ross stated that he would have pleasure in bringing down the return as requested. Col. Matheson asked him to have it complete.

In answer to Mr. Whitney, Mr. Hardy stated that only formal business would be taken up on Monday. The debate would be resumed and he hoped concluded on Tuesday. Mr. Whitney remarked that he did not know if the debate would be concluded on that day or not.