

Mr. MOWAT desired to perform all the duties appertaining to his office, but when the question arose the Treasurer got upon his feet to say what was to be said on behalf of the Government, and he was the proper officer to do so. When this matter had been brought up in a former session he (Mr. Mowat) had pointed out the constitutional rule that reports to the House should be brought down to the House, and he recollected occasions when the members of the Assembly had manifested considerable indignation that reports were printed and circulated before being presented to them. One would imagine, from the speeches of some hon. gentlemen, that the people were not in possession of any information whatever as to the revenue or whence it was derived, what was the expenditure, or in what direction it was made. There was no reason for such a belief. There was the statement of the receipts and expenditures which had been brought before the House a few days before. It was all very well for hon. members to speak contemptuously of this statement, but, as a matter of fact, it was more useful as a book of information to the general reader than the Public Accounts would be. Not one man in a hundred would be better informed by reading an elaborately detailed statement than with this review of the totals of expenditure.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Don't give us any more Public Accounts, and save the cost of printing.

Mr. MOWAT said if the hon. gentleman believed this to be the correct course the Government would be glad to have him submit a motion to that effect. What he was saying was in answer to the suggestion that it was necessary for the people themselves to have the details of the Accounts before they would be able to judge of the correctness or otherwise of the expenditure. And this statement that had been submitted was not by any means without details. He then proceeded to quote from the statement to show that the particular nature of receipts from the Dominion Government was shown, also the amounts received from each of the public institutions, &c., and that the expenses of the Works and Departments, particularly as regarded salaries, were given in very full detail. The donations to Hospitals and Charities were stated in a lump sum, but the special amount to each was fixed by statute, as hon. members knew. The cost of Colonization Roads was stated in the same way, but the report of the Commissioner of Crown Lands showed the details. All the information needed by hon. members was contained in the documents already before them. It seemed rather strange to hear hon. members opposite asking for details, when their practice was generally to avoid anything of that kind. They were in the habit of bringing in statements showing that the Government were spending some millions more than their revenue, and this without giving anything more than the totals of expenditure, so that no fair comparison could be made. He had before spoken of the constitutional rule upon this matter. A constitutional rule should not be retained when its effect was bad, but it should be retained unless it was shown to be a bad one. The amendment of the hon. member for London asked for the accounts to be placed before the people before the next election. As it was impossible to say when they could be got ready, it was asking the House to bind themselves to that which might turn out to be an impossibility. The reasons for the delay the Treasurer had fully and frankly explained. In view of the reasons he had given, he trusted the House would reject the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MORRIS said it was desirable the House should have the fullest information when they were called upon to vote supplies. He was surprised to learn it was an unnecessary thing to have the details. If it were not necessary, why were any details given in the statement of receipts and expenditures? In a mercantile house at the end of the year they not only looked over the details, but made also a general statement of the position to show the loss or gain for the year. When the people were going to be asked to vote upon the conduct of the Government, they should have full details of their career. The Commissioner of Public Works saw enormous difficulties in the way of giving a statement

into the hands of every man in the country. There were officers in the country through whom this might be done, and the difficulty might be practically overcome. There could be no reason why this should not be done, even if the details could not be given—and he could not see why they could not—to the House before the adjournment.

The amendment to the amendment was then put, and lost on the following division:—

Yeas.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder Brown, Calvin, Code, Coutts, Creighton, Currie, Deacon, Fletcher, Grange, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, McDougall, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morris, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Parkhill, Preston, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, White, Wills—33.

Nays.—Appleby, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooks, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Harcourt, Hardy, Hargraft, Hay, Hunter, Lane, Lyon (Algoma), Lyon (Halton), McCrae, McLaws, McLeod, McMahon, Massie, Master, Mowat, Pardee, Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood—45.

Mr. MEREDITH said that the hon. member for South Perth had voted, although it was understood that he had been paired with the hon. member for South Essex, who was not in his place.

Mr. BALLANTYNE said that he had voted on the understanding that he had not been paired.

Mr. WIDDIFIELD said that he had applied to his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to get him three pairs, one each for the hon. members for South Renfrew, Stormont, and Muskoka, but he had not been able to make such an arrangement. The pairing of the hon. member for South Essex with the hon. member for South Perth had not been reported to him. He would suggest that the name of the latter gentleman be struck off the division list. In making this arrangement he hoped that no pairs would hereafter be made without the knowledge of the party whips, as the reporting of such arrangements to them was the only way of avoiding confusion.

Mr. MEREDITH said that after the explanation of his hon. friend from North York he would ask that the name of the hon. member for North Perth be allowed to remain on the list.

The amendment was then carried without a division, after which the original amendment as amended was put and carried.

#### THE O'CARROLL CLAIMS.

Mr. WILLS moved for a Committee to enquire into the claims of the heirs of the late John O'Carroll, of Belleville, for losses incurred by him in the Rebellion of 1837-8. Carried.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF EX-CONVICTS.

Mr. BELL moved for "an Order of the House giving the details of the employment in the Central Prison of any individuals who had formerly been incarcerated therein, and especially the circumstances connected with the employment of four men, named respectively Collingwood, Morris, Parkinson, and Welsh." He made the motion for the purpose of ascertaining the number of prisoners employed as clerks, labourers, etc., and whether it was the practice to allow ex-prisoners to have free access to the prison premises. The statements embodied in his motion had appeared in a letter to the *Mail*, and had been contradicted by members of the Government. He thought it was possible that the Government might be misinformed as to the facts, and his motion was made to obtain, in the interests of the public, the fullest information. If the state of things mentioned in his motion existed, an explanation was afforded of the fires which had occurred in the institution.

Mr. WOOD said his hon. friend had either drawn largely upon his imagination or had been informed of something which had never occurred. He thought that when the returns were brought down they would show that ex-convicts had sometimes been temporarily employed in the Central Prison. He took the ground that they were justified in so employing them. The justice of the law was satisfied when their terms expired, and when private establishments were open to them was it to be said that the Central Prison was too good a place for them? The hon. member for West Toronto ought to have had some evidence before bringing the charge that fires in the Central Prison had been caused by ex-prisoners. An investigation had been held after the late fire had