

done.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT was gratified to see the interest the hon. leader of the Opposition felt in this matter, and said the hon. gentleman was always fond of affirming principles, because they were principles which he asserted the Reform party once professed, but now violated. The hon. member had given as a reason for the adoption of the policy of dividing counties for registration purposes that sometimes the income of the Registrar was too large. This was an extremely narrow ground on which to form such a policy. The point to be considered was, would the public interest be advantaged by it. He (Mr. Mowat) maintained that it was the duty of the House to interfere with the decisions of Committees when a strong and clear case was made out for such interference. Since they were satisfied that a wrong had been done in this instance, they were bound to correct that wrong. It was never to the interest of those outside the county to do business in a little village rather than in a county town, and he repudiated the construction that they were to consider the individual interest of the Registrar in preference to the interest of the general public. It was proper that the Registrar should receive some compensation if they interfered in this matter. The county had no objection to give him \$1,000 a year for five years, and the Commissioner of Public Works had suggested that payment for seven years. He could not understand the logic which suggested that a man has an interest in a large income but not in a small income. He pointed out that neither of the Registrars for the County of Huron were in accord with the Liberal Party. He admitted that a strong case must be made out before it was the duty of the Government to act, but in view of the evidence which had been brought before the House, both as to the public convenience of the matter and the feeling of the people, he was of opinion that such a case had been made out. He attached especial importance to the views of the local members upon this point, and when he found so much in favour of the Bill, backed up by the unanimous vote of the Reeves of the county, he thought there was sufficient cause shown why the motion should be supported.

The motion and the amendments were then put, and the House divided with the following result:—

YEAS—Messrs. Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Caldwell, Chisholm, Christie, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Clemens, Cook, Crooks, Crosby, Currie, Daly, Farewell, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Gow, Grauge, Haney, Hardy, Hodgins, McKellar, McLeod, Mowat, Oliver, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Sexton, Sinclair, Smith, Spetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, Wood—10.

NAYS—Messrs. Barber, Boulter, Boulton, Boulton, Calvin, Cameron, Code, Corby, Craig (Glengarry), Deacon, Fitzsimmons, Gifford, Giles, Graham, Guest, Hamilton, Lauder, McCall, McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, O'Donoghue, Prince, Read, Robert, Scott, Tooley, Williams (Durham)—29.

Hon. Mr. FRASER brought down the papers connected with the distribution of the Municipal Loan Fund.

The House then rose for recess.

#### THE ASSESSMENT ACT.

After recess,

Hon. Mr. CROOKS moved the third reading of the Act to amend the Assessment Act.

Hon. Mr. MOWAT moved an amendment that the Bill should be referred back to a Committee of the Whole to consider the advisability of making an amendment to sub-section 2 of section 71 for the purpose of equalizing assessment in towns and villages. He proposed to retain the original clause, and to let the equalization be made by the County Council.

The amendment was carried; as also was the amendment to the sub-section.

To the third sub-section,

Hon. ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved an amendment providing for appeals to County Judges. The amendments were both carried.

Mr. MONK moved in amendment to the 8th clause that the time for the return of the assessment roll be extended to the 8th July.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS opposed the motion, which was lost.

Mr. HODGINS proposed that live stock owned by a farmer shall be included amongst the exemptions, which was also lost.

The Committee then rose and reported the Bill with amendments.

#### INCORPORATION OF JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Hon. Attorney-General MOWAT moved the third reading of Bill respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by letters patent.

The motion was carried.

In answer to Mr. MEREDITH,

Hon. Mr. MOWAT said he thought it desirable to provide for the winding up of Joint Stock Companies. He proposed giving his attention to the subject, but it would be impossible to do so until next session.

#### THE LIQUOR BILL.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. CROOKS, the House then went into Committee of the Whole on the resolutions respecting Fermented and Spirituous Liquors, which were passed without amendment and reported.

The House then went into Committee on the Bill to amend and consolidate the law for the sale of fermented and spirituous liquors.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some slight amendments, and asked leave to sit again.

#### THE BALLOT.

The House next went into Committee on the Bill to provide for voting by ballot at elections. The first eighteen clauses were carried without amendment, after which the Committee rose and asked leave to sit again.

The House adjourned at 11:20.

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, March 3.

The Public Accounts Committee met this morning at 10 o'clock, and continued the examination of witnesses in regard to the Central Prison matter.

Mr. WAGNER, Superintendent, was recalled, for the purpose of giving evidence with regard to the letter of Mr. McKellar, and presenting the original if it were still in his possession. He stated that he had searched everywhere, both at the works and in his own office, and failed to find it. The time-keepers at the Prison—Messrs. Knifton and Lumley—had access to the safe in which witness kept any papers he might have there, but he thought he had put the letter in question in his business office. He had looked for it at the Prison on Saturday, and to-day at his own office. Messrs. Roberts, Munro and Hutchinson—men in his own employment—had access to his papers at the business office. He had shown the letter in question to Mr. Hellam, and Mr. Neill, of Dickey, Neill & Company, had asked to look at the document. He had not shown that gentleman the original, but gave him a copy of it to look at. He understood on Friday that he was to have produced the letter on Monday had he found it, but in consequence of a notification from the Chairman that he would not be required to attend until Tuesday, he deferred searching for it until this morning. He had never spoken to Mr. McKellar or any other member of the Government about giving the men the half holiday on nomination day, and had no communication with any of them on the subject except the letter referred to, which was brought to him at his business office. He believed he sent the letter up to Mr. Hellam, so that he might give the men the half holiday. He made no application to Mr. McKellar to let the men have the half day, and was not aware that any such application had been made; gave instructions that the accounts for the half day should be kept separate, because he thought it would not be fair that the amount should be chargeable against Mr. Elliot, who he understood all along would have to pay the difference in the cost of construction. He had no remembrance of the men being marched out to be addressed by Mr. Moss, but believed that gentleman did address them one day outside the premises during their dinner hour. There were 208 men got the half holiday, and their pay for that time would amount to \$204 17. In giving the men the half holiday he was anxious to assist Mr. Moss, and that the men should hear both sides of the question; could not say whether it was customary for employers of labour to let their men go upon occasions of that kind. Mr. Hellam was empowered to discharge or employ men. Saw Mr. McKellar this morning, but had no conversation with him about the letter. Saw Mr. Knifton about the Department but had no idea for what purpose he was there. The only instruction he had from any one was contained in the letter referred to, and he had no conversation with him or any of the workmen as to how they should vote. Mr. McKellar never instructed