

avored cumulative voting had been careful to limit it to large centres. In conservative England they had gone on contentedly for twenty years under the cumulative system for educational elections.

#### Amendments Suggested.

Dr. Nesbitt moved an amendment that the Trades and Labor Council be given representation on the board. The amendment was not pressed. Mr. Foy thought there should be two representatives of the Separate School Board on the new board.

The bill was reported, with some slight amendments.

#### Extending the High Court.

Col. Gibson explained his act to amend the judicature act, under motion for a second reading. He was not committed to the bill, but it had been found that the Supreme Court should have another division in order to cover the great amount of work offering. His own mind was not completely made up as to the best course to be taken, although as to the necessity of increasing the number of Judges there could be no doubt.

Mr. Foy (S. Toronto) said that, from an examination of the dockets, he could not find that there was any need for an additional two Judges of the High Court. The Court of Appeal was behind its work, and any additional Judge to be appointed should be an Appeal Judge.

The bill received a second reading.

Mr. Latchford's bill respecting local works and improvements, and Mr. Stratton's bill to amend the industrial schools act, were also given second readings.

#### Supplies Concurred in.

In the evening the report of the Committee of Supply was received and all the votes except three were concurred in. These three were \$158,410 special grants for agricultural purposes, \$68,597 for public works, and \$141,652.75 for miscellaneous.

Under the head of education Mr. S. J. Fox (West Victoria) asked whether anything was to be done to improve the position of the school inspectors, who now received very inadequate salaries. Hon. Mr. Harcourt replied that a bill now before the House would provide for a substantial increase in inspectors' salaries by way of travelling expenses.

#### The Frontenac Shrievalty.

Mr. J. S. Gallagher (Frontenac) moved for a return of all correspondence relating to a request of the Frontenac County Council for the dismissal of Sheriff Thomas Dawson. The difference between Sheriff Dawson and the County Council was not merely one relating to supplies, as stated by the Attorney-General. The Sheriff was not a very desirable officer, and had taken a very active part in the last election. He issued some 52 certificates to non-residents as agents for the Government candidate. One of these men named Carey, a boot and shoe merchant of Kingston, put in one vote where he was agent and another in Kingston. There were several other such cases. The Attorney-General should have paid more attention to the request of the County Council for the Sheriff's dismissal. There should be an investigation into the matter. Further, the Sheriff was empowered to issue two certificates to agents in each subdivision, but in one instance he had given three certificates, and when the ballot boxes were examined at Toronto, under an order for discovery, it was found that the certificates had been destroyed. He did not believe they had been destroyed in Kingston.

#### Not Sufficient Ground.

Col. Gibson thought that, so far as the friction between the County Council and the Sheriff was concerned, it was out of the question to comply with the request of the Council. There was friction in other counties. It would not be ground for dismissal, even if the Sheriff was wrong on a matter of that kind. If there was correspondence in any of the departments it would be brought down. If there was a grievance, the election law provided for redress. This was not the way to get

an investigation. Hon. gentlemen should pause before charging that certificates had been stolen, against a public officer who had no opportunity to come and give his explanation. There was no objection to the motion; the only objection was to the statements made, which should have come up in some other way.

The motion was passed.

#### Col. Matheson's Objections.

Col. Matheson moved for a return of correspondence between the Metropolitan Power Company and the Government for a grant of land under the waters of the Ottawa River. He objected to the fact that Mr. J. Lorne McDougall, jun., a partner of Hon. F. R. Latchford, had been employed to seek a grant from the Government, for which he had received a fee of \$1,000 or \$2,000.

Mr. Davis said Col. Matheson was fond of imputing motives, both there and in other quarters. In this connection he read from an evening paper a statement that the Public Accounts Committee room had been filled with Government officials, who applauded the remarks of Capt. Sullivan. Mr. Davis said there was not a Government official present beyond the clerk and the messenger.

Mr. St. John said Frank Sullivan was there, and he was until recently a Government employee. (Ministerial laughter.)

Mr. Graham said Sullivan was there as a witness subpoenaed by hon. gentlemen opposite. (Applause.)

Mr. Davis, proceeding, said: If Mr. McDougall did act it was to defend rights which his clients thought they had previously possessed. The Minister of Public Works never consulted with him in any way on the matter; it had been argued out wholly on its own merits. There was no objection to the motion.

Mr. Kidd (Carleton) said the lease would never have been given but for Mr. McDougall's connection with the firm of Latchford, McDougall & Day.

The motion was carried.

The House advanced a number of private bills and adjourned at 9.40 p.m.