stand the line of his hon. friend's argument. Supposing that the parties in this House were about equal, and the Dominion House, with a view to influencing the vote of some member, should offer him an employment involving a considerable sum of money. Did not the hon, gentleman see that this would be most improper?

*Mr. HARDY said whether correct or not, the Government had several precedents in the Government of Sandfield Macdonald.

Mr. MEREDITH, in connection with the item \$4,000 towards expenses in re Temperance Act of 1864, desired to call the attention of the Attorney-General to an important fact. All municipal by-laws as to the number of licenses, &c., in connection with the Crooks Act must be passed in the month of February. The voting on the repeal of the Dunkin Act in Prince Edward would not take place until March, so that if the Act were repealed the people would be left practically without either that or the license law until next February. It might be well to introduce some special legislation to meet the case.

in the Act of 1874 which provided that under special circumstances the License Commissioner was empowered to issue licenses. This would meet all the circumstances of the case put by the leader of the

Opposition.

Mr. MEREDITH desired to know why nothing had been asked for this year in connection with the Boundaries arbitration, as he understood that some amounts were still due.

Mr. MOWAT replied that the amounts due were not definite, but in any case would be so small that a special appropriation had not been deemed necessary.

Mr. SCOTT desired an explanation of the item, "To rein burse John A. Shibley his expenses in Queen v. Curl, and Queen v. McRory, out of moneys recovered under recognizances."

Mr. MOWAT stated that three men were tried in Napanee for larceny, Mr. Shibley prosecuting. One of the prisoners was let out on bail, but failed to appear, and his recognizances were forfeited and paid. As Mr. Shibley had been to actual expense to the amount of this item, it was deemed only just to afford him a share of the money sufficient to reimburse him.

Mr. DEACON desired to know, in the case of a prisoner under bail who-leaves the country and forfeits his recognizances, and subsequently either returns or is recovered, whether the Government ever retunds his bail, or if they ever instruct the Crown Attorney to not prosecute?

Mr. MOWAT replied that he certainly never did the second. With regard to the first, it would largely depend upon the circumstances of the cases. He had not known such a case to come up.

Mr. MEREDITH understood that in some cases of serious crime the Province bore a large part of the expense of prosecution, as for instance the Dain and Young murder cases. He thought that all such expenses should be paid by the municipalities.

The item was then passed.

With regard to the item Colonization Roads, \$96,300,

Mr. PARDEE stated that the amount asked for last year was \$85,700, or \$10,600 less than the present estimate. The increase was caused by the fact that new townships were being opened and colonization roads had to be built. The amount was framed with regard to the demand of the settlers and to the settlement of the country.

Mr. DEACON said that there was no item of Provincial expenditure from which the Province at large received so much proportionate benefit as that on colonization roads—(hear, hear)—therefore it was unfair to say that only the districts immediately affected reaped the benefit. They had been of value not only to the settlers but to the lumbermen and those entering the country.

Mr. BOULTER said though the rep re sentatives from the older counties might object to this expenditure ("No, no"), yet it might be contended that the money came from the unsettled country any way, for it was taken from the Crown lands. There had been complaints made concerning the expenditure on colonization roads in former years, but he trusted that,

under the present Commissioner, these complaints would be attended to, and all difficulties, so far as possible, obviated. There was a complaint made, however, that the supplies for the different roads were purchased in the city of Toronto, and not in the vicinity where the work was being done. He quoted from a letter he had received to the effect that an actual loss was suffered as compared with the price of goods in the vicinity of the work.

Mr. SCOTT thought the remarks of the last speaker should receive consideration at the hands of the Government. The additional expense of material sent in this way was considerable, and the system was an injustice to the municipalities in the neighbourhood of the roads under construction. He believed that a great deal of the expenditure upon these roads was made by political favour. He had a letter which stated that upon one particular road, though \$1,000 had been appropriated for, it not \$300 had gone into the road, the rest being paid in various other ways.

Mr. PARDEE said, concerning the purchase of supplies, that gentlemen opposite had insisted these should be purchased by contract—the flour and pork at least, and that policy had been adopted and acted upon by the Department. For several years past tenders had always been asked for and the lowest accepted, and the supplies distributed to the various works going on. It would be entirely impracticable to carry out a policy of the kind indicated by the last speakers. There were 40 or 50 works going on, and if the foreman of each were to buy his own supplies, a cry would be raised that they were acting improperly, and calling upon the Department to give up the system. The prices paid would be 50 per cent, more than those paid at the present time.

Mr. MEREDITH—You have that system in operation in connection with the public institutions.

Mr. PARDEE said they had so adopted it because each institution bought a very large quantity of supplies. So far as the favouritism was concerned, he denied it altogether. (Cheers.) The roads were being built simply with a view to the best interests of the Province. With regard to the road mentioned by the last speaker, as it was four and a half miles long, and as it took about \$200 a mile to build a road through such a country as it traversed, it would be seen that more than \$300 must have been put into the road. Letters such as this should not be too quickly accepted as truth, as they might be written by some interested supply dealer, or some man jealous because he had not been made foreman of some particular road. It would be a very popular move for the Government to buy its supplies from the country dealers, but it not being in the interests of the Province, they would not do it. (Cheers.)

Mr. BOULTER asked whether the contract for the building of the bridge across the Madawaska River had been let by tender.

Mr. PARDEE said it had. The practice of the Department in letting the contract for bridges was to apply to a certain number of firms who were well known as bridge builders, and to ask them to tender for the work. Of the tenders which were received in this way the lowest was accepted, and the contract let to the firm handing in the tender.

Mr. MEREDITH said he did notagree with the remarks that had fallen from some of the members that the expenditure upon colonzation roads should be guided by the revenue derived from the part of the country through which they were built. He contended that that expenditure could not fairly be classed amongst expenditures on capital account, as it was largely on account of repairs. The system of conducting the building of the roads was not, however, the best one. He did not accuse the Government of shutting out any road for political reasons, but he thought that in any doubtful cases the Government would favour a supporter. He also considered that the articles of supply should be purchased as near to the sections of the country through which the roads were made as possible, instead of in Toronto.

Mr. MILLER had formerly been of opinion that supplies should be purchased as his hon. friend from London had suggested, but he had had his opinion