

Mr. LAUDER declared that the Government were stultifying themselves as Reformers in refusing to affirm the resolution proposed.

Mr. ROSS said that in all cases where there was not a certificate attached to a pay-list it was accompanied by a letter. The system was, therefore, quite satisfactory. The practice of requiring foremen to swear to the correctness of pay-lists was never pursued by large contractors.

After a few remarks by Mr. Cameron, the amendment to the amendment was carried on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Hancy, Hardy, Hargraft, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McMahon, Massie, Master, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—46.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Calvin, Cameron, Code, Countz, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, McDougall (Middlesex), McDougall (Simcoe), McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, O'Sullivan, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Scott, Tooley, Wigle, Wills—31.

The resolution as amended was concurred in.

Mr. WOOD moved, "That the item of \$14,500 for the Agricultural College be concurred in."

Mr. CREIGATON moved in amendment, "That the sum be reduced to five thousand dollars, which would be required to meet the amounts due the banks."

Mr. MERRICK moved in amendment to the amendment, "That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following words be added to the resolution:—'This House regrets that owing to the unsatisfactory management of the Agricultural College the large sum of five thousand dollars was drawn from the banks in 1874 without the proper authority of the House, or the sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor.'" In support of his motion he said the large amount of \$5,000 had been over-expended in the year 1874 for the maintenance of the Agricultural College, and, for some reason that had not been explained, that over-expenditure had not been mentioned to the House. The Government had been derelict in their duty in neglecting to place this sum in the Estimates for four years, from 1874 to 1878, while the Province had all the while to pay interest upon it.

Mr. HARDY referred to the statement of Mr. Johnson, Principal of the Agricultural College, made before the Public Accounts Committee on Saturday last—a statement which he believed was incontrovertible. He repeated the substance of Mr. Johnson's statement to show how the overdraft was incurred. Vouchers were produced before the Committee showing that it was for the payment of articles required in the maintenance of the institution, and not one member of the Committee disputed the correctness of those vouchers or the necessity for the expenditure. There were two grounds of objection to the matter—first, that it was irregular to make the overdraft without there having been a vote for it in 1874; and second, that it should have been placed in the Estimates for the following year. He showed, by references to Mr. Johnson's evidence, that it was too late to have the sum placed in the Estimates for 1875 when Mr. Johnson called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it, about the 20th of December, 1874: that the attention of the Treasurer had never been called to the subject in the regular way in writing either by Mr. Johnson or the Minister of Agriculture; and that no notice from the bank was received till 1877. No one was particularly to blame for the matter; it had merely been overlooked until 1877, when the attention of the Treasurer having been called to the irregularity, the amount was at once placed in the Estimates. At its worst, the matter was merely an error, there had been no charge of wrong-doing in connection with it, and no one disputed that the \$5,000 was properly expended. (Cheers.)

Mr. MEREDITH thought the Provincial Secretary was not justified in attempting to throw the blame of this neglect on the

late Commissioner of Agriculture or the Principal of the College. He believed that the knowledge of the overdraft had been designedly withheld by the Government in order to make the public believe that the institution was working more satisfactorily than it really was.

Mr. CROOKS said he was quite prepared to assume all the censure to which he was entitled in regard to this matter. He had no desire to shrink from any responsibility which was attached to him in connection with it, and least of all did he desire to make Mr. Johnson the scape-goat of the transaction. (Hear, hear.) Anyone who heard the Principal's statement must admit that he was the least to blame for the irregularity that had occurred. The simple facts were, that at the end of three months after Mr. Johnson went to the College the funds appropriated for the year were exhausted, and the usual means were used to supply the deficiency, viz: an overdraft was obtained from the bank, with the understanding that it would be covered in the ordinary way by an appropriation of the Legislature. This was not done; there being an absence of those business modes of bringing the matter to the attention of himself or the Minister of Agriculture, it was overlooked. He was perfectly willing that any impartial person should examine the facts, which fully excused any omission or irregularity which had taken place.

Mr. Merrick's amendment to the amendment was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Code, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Scott, Tooley, Wigle, Wills—25.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Gibson, Graham, Hardy, Hargraft, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McMahon, Massie, Master, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—44.

Mr. MILLER moved in amendment to the amendment, "That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following words be added to the resolution:—'It appears that the sum of five thousand dollars mentioned as being in the Canadian Bank of Commerce was absolutely required to carry on the institution until the end of 1874; and it is believed that the said sum was duly expended in the public interest; and it also appears by the proper vouchers in that behalf that the said sum has not heretofore been put into any appropriation; therefore it is expedient that the said appropriation be made.'"

The amendment to the amendment was carried on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Appleby, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Calvin, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Gibson, Graham, Hardy, Hargraft, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McMahon, Massie, Master, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Patterson (York), Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—45.

NAYS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Boulter, Broder, Cameron, Code, Countz, Creighton, Deacon, Flesher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, McDougall (Middlesex), Macdougall (Simcoe), McGowan, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, O'Sullivan, Patterson (Essex), Preston, Scott, Tooley, Wigle, Wills—28.

The following resolutions were concurred in without opposition:—

Expense of works at the Government House, Toronto, \$4,000.

Construction and repairs of Colonization roads, \$85,700.

Mr. WOOD moved the resolution granting \$50,000 for Unforeseen and Unprovided expenses.

Mr. MERRICK moved in amendment, "That the said resolution be not now concurred in, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by reducing the sum by \$30,000 so as, not to leave so large a sum as \$50,000 to be expended at the mere will of the Government, and in opposition to principles formerly enunciated that no large expenditure of public money should be made without a direct vote of Parliament sanctioning the particular application of said appropriation."

Mr. HODGINS moved in amendment to the amendment, "That this House, having during the last and present Parliaments