

Public, Separate, and High Schools.

CONVEYING PRISONERS, &c.

Mr. CASCADEN asked when the return stating in detail the name and cost of conveying each lunatic to the different asylums; prisoners to the penitentiary at Kingston; prisoners to the Central Prison; boys to the Reformatory; for the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, and 1878, ordered on the 3d March, 1879, will be presented.

Mr. MOWAT said the information would be contained in a return ordered by the House yesterday.

The motion was withdrawn.

TILE DRAINAGE.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for an order of the House for a return showing the number of applications since last session for loans which have been made under the Tile Drainage Act of 1878; also the amended Act of 1879; the municipalities by which such applications have been made; the sums actually paid out of the fund and the municipalities to which such payments have been made.

Mr. LAUDER asked the mover to state how this measure was working in Western Ontario, as it had been a hobby of the hon. member's.

Mr. GRAHAM assured the hon. member that the Act had worked well during the past year in his county, and it was going to do still better in the future.

Mr. CREIGHTON remarked that this Act was yet so imperfect that of the \$200,000 set apart under it only \$700 had been applied for, and that was by the township of Warwick, in the county the hon. member represented. Perhaps with some further amendments this Bill would by-and-by be put in such a shape that farmers could get some advantage from it.

Mr. MEREDITH thought the Treasurer should give the House some information as to how this Act was working.

Mr. WOOD did not think a motion for a return should call for any explanations from him. He could however see no objection to amending this or any other measure whose practical working showed amendments to be necessary; for they could not expect their legislation to be perfect from the beginning. The Act had not yet had a fair trial (hear, hear); for during the very depressed period of the past two or three years the farmers had quite enough to do to keep themselves afloat. Nevertheless, there had been several applications under the Act.

Mr. MEREDITH—About how much?

Mr. WOOD could not say precisely, but something like \$8,000 or \$10,000.

The motion was carried.

INFRINGEMENTS OF THE LICENSE LAW.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) moved for an Order of the House for a return for the years 1877, 1878, and 1879, showing for each License District in the Province the number of convictions under the Act respecting the sale of fermented or spirituous liquors, for:—(1) Selling without license, and (2) selling on Sunday or after seven o'clock on Saturday night, or during any other days or hours, contrary to any statute in force in the Province or any by-law in force in any of such districts, showing also how many of the latter class have, subsequent to conviction, been re-licensed.

Mr. MEREDITH said he did not know the object of the motion, but he would like to call the attention of the Government to the course taken by License Commissioners in some parts of the country. In London the Commissioners had employed a man named Donaldson and his wife to go about to induce people to infringe the law, and then inform on them, paying them so much for each conviction. Some people not at all in the liquor business had been convicted, but a charge of perjury was brought against Donaldson, and it being sustained he was sent to prison. He believed that the county of Lincoln had a case of a somewhat similar nature, and he thought the Government should adopt some measures to prevent the repetition of such flagrant abuses.

Mr. BELL held that license affairs in Toronto were in a disgraceful state. For some time there was only

one Commissioner, and he doubted if the full number even now was appointed. He claimed that the power of licensing had been used to influence elections. If this conduct on the part of officials was without the sanction of the Government they should look into it, and the officials, if guilty, should be dismissed. He had charged his opponent with this at the election, but he believed that personally that gentleman was free from it.

Mr. HARDY said it must be plain to every hon. member that in many cases the personal efforts of the License Inspector could not secure convictions, even of people who were flagrantly and continually violating the law. Detectives were therefore appointed, particularly in the cities, to secure evidence against such people. These detectives could only be appointed by resolution of the Board, sanctioned by the Department. They were, he believed, except in small places, paid a stated allowance. If, however, their recompense was conditional upon a conviction being secured, the instructions of the department were that a conviction should not be pressed upon the evidence of the inspector or detective alone, but if possible to let it rest on outside evidence. By this means also those officials were saved from considerable odium which would attach to them were they sent into the box to give their evidence. These detectives were not paid except with the sanction of the department. He believed that in the case in London mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, sanction had been given to some payments made to the party spoken of. He believed that the cases mentioned by the hon. member were the only ones of the kind that had occurred, and that with these exceptions the law had worked with great satisfaction. (Cheers.) In reference to what had been said by the member for West Toronto, he believed that it was only for a short time that there were not two License Commissioners. With regard to the conduct alleged of the Toronto officials the statements made were altogether general. If the hon. gentleman were to look over the records he would find that twelve out of fifteen of those holding licenses in Toronto were good Conservatives, and this, if anything, should disprove the allegations made. There were, probably, cases in which Conservatives had not been granted licenses, but he believed that the refusals were based strictly on the merits of the several cases. The hon. gentleman should not, before he was prepared to make a specific statement, bring forward general accusations of this character. (Cheers.) With regard to the candidate who had come so very near defeating the hon. member, he (Mr. Hardy) did not know of anything blameworthy in his conduct. The License Board of Toronto was, he believed, generally regarded as a good one, and the Inspector was believed to have performed his duties with all diligence.

Mr. LAUDER—And with very little success.

Mr. HARDY—Considering the difficult nature of the work, I think with very great success.

Mr. LAUDER—There is more dissatisfaction than ever with the law.

Mr. FRASER—And more convictions by means of it. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. LAUDER attacked the course followed by Dr. Ogden in becoming a candidate against the present member for West Toronto, claiming that Dr. Ogden was a Government official up to the very day before the election.

Mr. HARDY said that if his memory served him well Dr. Ogden had resigned his position as License Inspector immediately on becoming a candidate for election.

Mr. LAUDER said in any case it was no credit to the Government to have had as a candidate on their side a man who was a Government official up to the eve of the election, and whose resignation was not published, and not generally known by the electors even up to the day of the contest. The Provincial Secretary had accused the member for West Toronto of recklessness, yet he himself was guilty of the same in saying without any authority that twelve out of fifteen of the license