

The consideration of the details of the Bill showed a great many difficulties as to the boundary lines to be provided. The views of both parties interested were heard, and several members of the Committee spoke urging the importance to the whole Province of a satisfactory decision. It was finally agreed that the matter should be adjourned to allow the parties to come to some agreement, on the basis of the town of Clifton being compelled to spend the taxation acquired from the South Ward upon improvements in the roads and other works of the locality.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

The Public Accounts Committee met this morning at 11 o'clock. Present:—Messrs. Clarke (Wellington) in the chair, Lauder, Harcourt, Wood, Wills, Ferris, Ballantyne, Striker, and Gibson. Various motions had been made on Tuesday for papers, but the members making them—viz., Messrs. Merrick, Meredith, Deacon, and Ross—were not in attendance. The Committee consequently adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

HURON AND ONTARIO SHIP CANAL.

This Committee met for organization this morning. Dr. Widdifield was called to the chair. There were present also Messrs. Morris, Bell, Chisholm, Deroche, Hunter, Lane, and Long. Mr. F. C. Capreol appeared and addressed the Committee, urging the importance of the work which they were appointed to consider. A sub-Committee, consisting of the Chairman and Messrs. Morris and Long, was appointed to consult with Mr. Capreol and arrange a plan of work.

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

THIRD PARLIAMENT—FOURTH SESSION.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The following is the conclusion of Wednesday night's debate:—

Mr. ROSS (who on rising was received with cheers) said that he had been at a loss to arrive at the figures which the hon. gentleman who had made the motion had placed in it. He had understood that it was the intention of that hon. gentleman to compare the expenditures of 1868 and 1871, deducting the outlay on account of Public Works and Buildings. The total expenditure in 1868 was \$1,182,389, and the expenditure on Public Works and Buildings was \$162,747, and deducting the latter sum from the former there remained the sum of \$1,020,000, whereas the amount placed in the resolution was \$1,056,000. It had taken him some time to discover how the discrepancy had arisen. But he found included in the cost of Public Works and Buildings for 1868 the sum of \$36,901 for Colonization Roads, which the hon. gentleman had deducted from that amount before deducting it from the total expenditure for 1868. Anyone unacquainted with the tactics of the Opposition would be at a loss to understand why that deduction had been made. But the reason was that the outlay on colonization roads had very largely increased in 1878, and that if the mover of the resolution had included that sum in his comparison it would not have told so favourably for him in arriving at the conclusion he had arrived at. If the items for Municipalities and Land Improvement funds, amounting to \$163,000, were also deducted from the expenditure of 1871, the amount was still larger than it had been placed at in the resolution. He had, though with considerable difficulty, arrived at the items which made up that difference. They were \$25,000 for sufferers by the Ottawa fire, \$5,000 for similar relief to the sufferers by the Saguenay fire, and \$19,505 for expenses of elections. He had experienced equal difficulty in finding out how the hon. gentleman had arrived at his statement of the expenditure for 1878. He found that the only item which he deducted from the total expenditure for that year was \$298,000 for Public Works and Buildings. He found in the Public Accounts for 1878 items both for Municipalities Fund and Land Improvement Fund, and he could not conceive why the hon. gentleman did not deduct these from the expenditure of that year, as he had done from that of 1871, if he were desirous of making a fair comparison between those two years. The expenditure under these heads had been exclusively in the interests of the people, and yet when the hon. gentleman was in search of items for the purpose of reducing the expenditure of 1871 he had selected those items, though including them in the expenditure for 1878. (Hear, hear.) If he had looked as carefully over the items composing Miscellaneous Expenditure in 1878, as he had for 1871, he would have found some just as exceptional as those for the Ottawa and Saguenay fires, and he asked why he had not taken them from the total expenditure in 1878 before making a comparison between that year and 1871.

Mr. MEREDITH asked the hon. gentleman to point out any such items.

Mr. ROSS said that in 1868 the exceptional expenditure of a gratuity to Mrs. Mackenzie of \$4,000, aid to Nova Scotia fishermen of \$5,000, and the grant to Colleges of \$30,600 had been made, which should properly have been deducted before a comparison were made between that year and 1871. But the hon. gentleman refused to make these reductions, because if he had done so he would not have been able to say that there had been only an increase of twelve per cent. between 1868 and 1871, and his comparison would consequently have been made less favourable to himself. These items had been purposely omitted by the hon. gentleman, it was impossible to think that he could have overlooked them. In 1878 there were also the exceptional expenditures of \$4,000 for arbitration between Ontario and Quebec, \$4,000 in connection with the north and western boundaries, \$16,179 for insurance