

pected that that would drain all the country, but they thought it would be an incentive to high draining in the country. He expected that this Bill would be acceptable to everyone, and he was glad to find that the farmers approved of it. His impression was that in the journal edited by the member for South Simcoe he advocated earnestly the adoption of tile drainage. He (the speaker) then quoted from a report made by the hon. member for South Simcoe twenty-four years ago to the Minister of Education approving highly of high drainage, and saying that the matter should not be overlooked by the Government. He (the speaker) was afraid that the opposition to this Bill was not an opposition in the interests of the farmer, as it professed to be.

Mr. ROSEVEAR said that he had been misunderstood. What he wanted to say was that he approved of underdrainage, but thought that the farmers could pay for it themselves.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said that he had seen reason to modify his youthful aspirations in regard to high farming, which he now believed to be unprofitable in this country. He questioned if Government was not exceeding its functions in lending out money in the manner proposed.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) opposed the Bill, and suggested that it lie over. Perhaps the Government in recess could mature a Lands Improvements Act.

The House went into Committee on the resolution and passed it, and the House concurred in the resolution.

Mr. WOOD then introduced a Bill respecting the investment of public moneys in debentures issued for the construction of tile drains in municipalities and townships.

#### SUPPLY.

The House then went into Committee of Supply.

On the item of \$28,000 for Public Works,

Mr. LAUDER complained that there was no system of checking the pay-sheets sent to the Public Works Department for payment by the foremen on the bridge and river works. The Government had to trust entirely to the honesty of the foremen, who were generally their own political friends. He suggested that the foremen ought to be made to send a declaration along with the pay-lists.

Mr. FRASER said that if a foreman was not honest, all the declarations he might make would not make him so, and there was just as good a check on him now as if he accompanied his pay-lists with a declaration. Occasionally, also, an officer from the Department was sent out to the works, unknown to the foreman, to see that the men were properly paid, and that nothing wrong was going on. After all, he had more faith in the honesty of the foreman than in all the marks on pay-lists, or the certificates, that might be made, and if a man in the employment of the Government was found not to be honest, his services would not be retained for an hour. It was not fair to insinuate that these men would take advantage of opportunities of peculation, when there was no real ground for such an insinuation.

Mr. DEACON said that, notwithstanding, there was a careless way of receiving these pay-lists, and they furnished opportunities for wrong-doing to dishonest men. The accounts should be properly vouched and sworn to.

Mr. ROSS said he had made enquiries into this matter, and he found that the accounts were always accompanied by a letter stating that they were the pay-lists and were correct, and he thought that was a better check than the signing of a name at the bottom of the pay-lists. But the most effectual check was the sending of an officer from the Department to visit the works sometimes, to pay the men himself, and to see that the accounts were correct. The practice pursued by the Department was the same as that pursued by large private contractors.

Mr. GIBSON said the hon. member for East Grey had charged that these foremen were friends of the Government, while Mr. Molesworth had distinctly stated before the Public Accounts Committee that they had been, with few exceptions, employed by the previous Government.

Mr. WILLS thought the man to whom the money was entrusted for payment should be held responsible for its proper payment, and should furnish the Department with satisfactory vouchers.

Mr. CAMERON believed that the system pursued in the Crown Lands Department was as correct a one as could be adopted. The receipt of the man who received the money was placed at the bottom of the pay-list, and the foreman of the works made his affidavit to its correctness. No charge was made against any particular individual, but those who were acquainted with the way the works were being conducted knew that the Government were being cheated. He thought the system prevailing in the Crown Lands Department should be adopted in the Public Works Department.

The item was passed.

On the item of \$85,700 for colonization roads,

Mr. PARDEE said there was nothing that required any special explanation. The amount voted in 1877 was \$77,300. An appropriation of \$3,500 was set apart for roads in Manitoulin Island in consequence of the representations of the hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. CAMERON—Have you any special roads in mind?

Mr. PARDEE replied that there were three roads, and an inspector was to be sent, up to lay them out before the money was to be paid.

Mr. CAMERON expressed his approval of the appropriation.

Mr. SINCLAIR was glad that the Government had recognized the justice of rendering assistance to the Indian settlers in Manitoulin. He hoped something would also be done towards opening up the new townships in North Bruce, where the roads were very bad.

Mr. DEACON protested against the unfair division of the colonization grants, which were entirely in favour of the western division. There was a proportionately small amount set apart for the eastern division, which, he contended, was entitled to more aid than it received. The Commissioner had a memorial for a year, asking for a bridge across the

Muskoka River, and he hoped \$500 would be set apart for that work.

Mr. PARDEE said it was true that the western or Muskoka division was getting the largest grant; but these appropriations were made simply according to the requirements of settlers, and as the greater number of new settlers went there, the greater amount of money should, of course, be spent there. With reference to memorials asking for colonization roads, he had received hundreds of them, and if he agreed to them all he would have to ask for \$700,000 instead of \$70,000.

Mr. DEROCHE would be in favour of even more money being expended on colonization roads than was expended now. There was no money more profitably spent. He hoped the House would vote an increased amount to the eastern sections, where there was a great variety of resources.

Mr. CREIGHTON was glad the Government had decided to do something towards opening up Manitoulin Island, which was destined to be one of the most important parts of the Province. As it was Indian land, however, he thought the Dominion Government should have spent any necessary money for its improvement. He supported the hon. member for North Bruce in his request for aid to the Indian settlements in his constituency.

Mr. DAWSON said this grant to Manitoulin Island was the first which had been granted since Confederation. The sums granted for the other parts of Algoma, though small, had been exceedingly well spent; they were productive of great good, and led to the expenditure of three times the amount expended on the roads. He was gratified to find that the grant for Manitoulin Island was so favourably received by the House.

Mr. GIBSON hoped the relief asked for by the hon. member for North Bruce would be granted.

Mr. SCOTT mentioned a district in his own constituency which required a colonization road. He believed that if the Commissioner paid more attention to details, the money expended for these roads would go much farther than it did. There was a particular case of which he had been informed, in which \$300 was paid in wages out of \$1,000 appropriated for the work. One reason of the excessive expenditure was that supplies were bought at Toronto instead of at the places where the work was done.

Mr. PARDEE said that he paid as full attention to the appointment of overseers, &c., as was possible in the Department. In the particular case referred to, the man in charge had been well recommended when he came into the Government's employ, but it had been afterwards found that he had been guilty of irregularities, and he was removed. With reference to supplies, he thought everybody would concede that it was more economical to purchase them in large quantities than to trust to obtain them at the little places where they might be required.

Mr. BOULTER expressed the opinion that the money was not as economically spent as it might be, and urged the claims of the county of Hastings for the repair of several roads there.

Mr. LAUDER alleged that the estimates were made for certain roads, while the money was spent on other roads. In 1876 votes were taken for thirty roads, while the money was spent on sixty-six roads. He thought it would be better to appropriate the money in a lump sum, as was done in the time of the late Government.

Mr. PARDEE said the hon. gentleman was entirely misleading the House. He forgot that there was a sum of \$30,000 set apart for short new roads, which was expended on 20 or 30 new roads. If the hon. gentleman would compare the estimates for 1876 with the report of the Commissioner of Crown Lands for that year, he would find that in nearly every case the money was spent as it was appropriated.

The item was then passed, and the Committee rose.

Mr. FRASER presented a return relating to the discovery of gold in the township of Marmora.

The House adjourned at 12 midnight.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Scott—On Monday next—Bill to amend Section 18 of Chapter 2 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario respecting University of Toronto.

Mr. Grange—On Monday next—Order of the House for a return giving the names of all Magistrates at present on the Commission of the Peace, with the date of their appointment, the date of their qualification, and the counties for which they are respectively appointed.

Mr. Gibson—On Monday next—Order of the House for a return showing, so far as the general hospitals of Toronto and London are concerned, amounts received from each municipality in payment of patients' maintenance and for patients residents of Toronto and London; income from property belonging to hospitals, value and description of said property, fees charged to residents, fees charged to non-residents; also showing the position of any funds held by the city of London and county of Middlesex for hospital purposes; also, a copy of the agreement between the city of London and county of Middlesex with reference to such fund.