Here Mr. Ferguson took up the examination and went over the ground formerly covered by Mr. Bowman, that the item was only a cross entry in the books of the Treasury Department. It did not enter into the Auditor's books at all.

"If you take this item of \$544,000 away from current receipts, you must also take it away from the amount of interest on the capital side."

"That should be excluded on both

sides," said Mr. Clancy.

#### Mr. McGarry's Explanation.

Mr. McGarry here took up the discussion and endeavored to show how the item had been treated in the books of the Treasury Department. Mr. Wm. Douglas, Chief Clerk, explained that in the column of payments, statutory expenditure of \$2,-233,702 included payments of all interest charges on loans made by the Province. The amount was \$794,491 for the capital investment in the T. & N. O. Railway. The Province had received only \$250,000 from the railway last year, so the balance of \$544,491 had to be made up, which was done by transferring from consolidated revenue account that amount and charging it to the balance of the \$2,000,000 subsidy received a year ago from the Federal Government. In that way, deducting the item of \$544,491 from ordinary receipts and ordinary expenditures, the difference between these remains the same as previously stated-namely, \$697,000.

## LIBERAL AMENDMENT LOST BY 69 TO 23

#### AT 3 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING DIVISION CAME IN THE LEGISLATURE.

It was not until 3 o'clock yesterday morning that the Legislature reached the conclusion of the debate on the second reading. After the Premier had finished, Mr. Allan Studholme (East Hamilton) took up the discussion and criticized the Government for being half-hearted in its proposals. If the measure was worth while it should go farther. He advocated that drinking in clubs should be restricted, along with shops and bars. He disapproved of the clauses in the bill making the decisions of the board subject to order in Council. "You will not get any body of men in the Province able to administer the law impartially if they are subject to the Cabinet," he said. "Make your Commission wholly independent like the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board."

Mr. Proudfoot's amendment rejected on a vote of 69 to 23, the division being as follows:

For the amendment: Atkinson, Bowman, Carter, Clarke, Davidson, Evanturel, Ferguson (Kent), Gillespie, Grieve, Ham, Hurdman, Lang, McDonald, Marshall, Munro, Parliament, Proudfoot, Racine, Richardson, Rowell, Studholme, Tolmie, Wigle-

Against the amendment: Allan, Armstrong, Bennewies, Black, Brower, Calder, Cameron, Carew, Cargill, Carscallen, Chambers, Cook, Crawford, Dargavel, Devitt, Donovan, Duff, Edgar, Fallis, Ferguson (Simcoe), Ferguson (Grenville), Gooderham, Grant, Grigg, Hall (Lanark), Hall (Waterloo), Hanna, Hartt, Hearst, Henry, Hook, Hoyle, Irish, Jarvis, Johnson, Lennox, Lucas, McCrae, Mc-Elroy, McFarlan, McGarry, Mc-McPherson, Macdiarmid, Keown, Machin, Magladery, Martyn, Mason, Mills, Morel, Musgrove (Huron), Musgrove (Niagara Falls), Nesbitt, Owens, Pratt, Preston (Durham), Preston (Lanark), Price, Pyne, Rankin, Regan, Russell, Rykert, Sharpe, Sinclair, Sulman, Thompson (Simcoe), Thompson (Peterboro'), Torrance-69.

Pairs-Foy, Elliott; Gamey, Mageau.

# OF BOARD DENIED

### LEGAL COMMITTEE OF LEGISLA-TURE REFUSES CHANGE FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION.

When the Legal Committee of the Legislature met yesterday afternoon to consider the proposal to elect the members of the Board of Education in Toronto annually instead of every two years, Mayor Church took occasion to remark that the board was one of the most extravagant bodies with which the city had to deal. The committee reported against the bill, and declined a suggestion by the city that the question might be submitted to the ratepayers.

Mr. C. A. B. Brown thought an annual election would be a great mistake. The members of the board served without remuneration, and elections cost money. In two years a man had a better chance of getting in touch with conditions.

Alderman McBride said the Board of Education had always been a municipal football. He didn't think the members of the City Council were all in favor of the change.

The Mayor said Alderman McBride didn't represent the whole Council. The Council had been unanimous in favor of the change.

"Unanimous?" interjected Alderman McBride.

"Well, not quite, but nearly so," replied the Mayor.

The mention of extravagance by the Mayor brought the query from Hon. R. A. Pyne: "Is the object of this bill to curtail expenditure on the education of the children of the city?"

"The city cannot stand all this ex-

penditure," said the Mayor.

Trustee Hodgson pointed out that the city had taken in thousands of acres of new territory since 1900. In that year the rate for school purposes was only 5 1/2 mills, and it was only 6 mills in 1914. Eighty per cent. of the expenditures had been forced on the board by the city.