

LIVELY INCIDENT IN LEGISLATURE.

Sharp Exchange on Discussion of University Grant.

BUDGET DEBATE ENDED.

Mr. Currie's Appeal For a Wider Educational System.

More Attention Should be Paid to Commercial and Technical Education—Religious Instruction in the German Schools—Opposition Members in Legislature Make Excellent Addresses.

A lively incident occurred during the debate on the budget in the Legislature yesterday afternoon. It was precipitated by Mr. Atkinson. While expressing his objections to the basis on which the funds for the university were provided, the Premier interrupted to say that last session was the time when he should have given prominence to his protests. Mr. Graham and Mr. MacKay both rallied at once to the support of their colleague on the Opposition benches. The latter replied that the House had been divided last session on the question as to whether the succession duties should form the basis for the university grant. The records of the House, as a matter of fact, show that on May 10, 1906, the House did divide on the question. Mr. MacKay, seconded by Mr. Auld, moved an amendment that the word "that" in the main resolution be omitted and the following be substituted: "The bill be not now read a third time, but be forthwith recommitted to a committee of the whole House, with instructions to amend clause 140, first, by striking out the words 'a sum equal to 50 per centum of the average yearly gross receipts of the Province from succession duties' and inserting the following: 'Such sums as may be appropriated by the Legislative Assembly on report of the board, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.'" The amendment was lost on a vote of 12 to 51.

Mr. MacKay also took very strong ground against the Board of Governors of the university holding private meetings when dealing with public moneys voted for the institution. These meetings should be open to the press.

Mr. Studholme, the Labor member, made a somewhat remarkable contribution to the debate, which closed at night, all the items in the main estimates being passed. Mr. Pattinson defended the Government at some length. Mr. Currie contributed a thoughtful and well-worded address on the advisability of a wider educational policy, particularly in respect to technical and commercial education.

Mr. Preston (Brant) complained of the delay in bringing down the report of the investigation into the management of the Institute for the Blind at Brantford. The Minister of Education replied that the same commissioner had conducted the investigation into the management of the institution at Belleville, and that this accounted for the delay.

The House went into committee on Mr. Foy's bill respecting the form and interpretation of the statutes. The measure is of a highly technical char-

acter. In clause 2, "Revised Statutes, 1907," will read simply "Revised Statutes," the year being considered unnecessary. The act aims to be specific. In one clause, for example, stress is laid on the word "person," which under the law shall be held to mean "any body, corporate or politic, and the heirs, executors, administrators or other legal representatives of a person to whom the context can apply according to law."

The word "holiday" shall include Sunday, New Year's Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Christmas Day, the King's birthday, or the day fixed by proclamation of the Governor-General for its celebration. Victoria Day, Dominion Day, Labor Day, and any day appointed by proclamation of the Governor-General or the Lieutenant-Governor as a public holiday, or for a general fast or thanksgiving. Whenever a holiday falls on Sunday the day following shall be observed.

Resumes Budget Debate.

Mr. Atkinson (North Norfolk) resumed the debate on the budget. Taking up the question of prison labor, he declared that prisoners should be made to work ten hours a day, but their labor should not be allowed to conflict with free labor. Men courted short terms in prison because it afforded shelter and easy work during the winter months. They should be put on a prison farm and made to work hard. The Montreal River pulpwood contract, as made by the old Government, was defended. The terms of that contract were calculated to develop Ontario, while the present Government's policy was simply a plan to expand the coffers of Ontario.

Touching on the matter of the Provincial loan, Mr. Atkinson pointed out that a renewal of the treasury bills should not have been negotiated until after the close of the South African war, when money in Great Britain would have been cheaper. He would have renewed every six months for three years if necessary, instead of losing to the Province a quarter of a million dollars.

The Provincial Treasurer had said very little about the Niagara Falls commission. They had been led to believe that within a year or two the pulse of the Province would beat with the power of Niagara. The conditions were about the same to-day as they were then. He believed in cheap power, but if the Government could not get power as cheaply as they thought they could let them say so—let them tear away the veil. The Hamilton people had been forced to increase the cost of power to \$30 per horsepower, indicating that the tendency was for prices to advance. The gas producer plant at a distance of some forty miles or more had Niagara power beaten twice over. Mr. Atkinson proceeded to charge the Government with having sold and even given away timber rights along the Government railroad without advertising, contrary to their pre-election expressions. The Speaker said that he objected to the way the grant was made to the University of Toronto.

Lively Passage-at-arms.

The Premier interrupted to say that last year, when the university grant was being considered was the time for the hon. gentleman to have made his objections.

Mr. MacKay—The House was divided on that question.

The Premier replied that heretofore the Government had given both sides of the House credit for the work done on behalf of the university. The time might come when the truth would have to be known how near the work came to being undone by members of this House.

Mr. Graham said that the position taken by the Opposition last year was that they were opposed to having the grants to the university ear-marked.

Mr. Whitney—They are not ear-marked.

Mr. Graham replied that he had opposed as strongly as he could the suggestion that the succession duties should be mixed up in any way with the university.

The Premier—The hon. gentleman may divide the House on the question if he wants to, but I suspect he won't.