

dredweight, and to the second that the cost had been \$36 89 per head.

Notices of motion followed. Mr. Haggerty had one on the order paper for a return of the amount of money received from the sale of timber limits in North Hastings in the last 30 years, and spent in the same riding during the same period for colonization roads. He now explained that he found that the compilation of the order would be too laborious to be worth while, as he already had been given all the information necessary by Hon. Mr. Hardy. Accordingly, he dropped the order, and it was discharged.

FEES COMMISSION WITNESSES.

A rather interesting discussion followed upon the subject of the Fees Commission. Mr. Kerns moved for a return showing the names, residences and occupations of all persons who gave evidence before the Fees Commission. To this Sir Oliver Mowat replied that, so far as possible, the information was in the report and the appendix, but with regard to the residence and occupation of a number of the witnesses no note had been made, so that there was no means of giving all the information asked for by the order, except by means of a great deal of correspondence, and that the Premier hardly thought worth while, as he supposed the motion had been made on the supposition that the Government was in possession of the information.

Mr. Kerns replied that he thought it an important thing to have a record kept of the witnesses whose evidence helped to make up the report by which the House was to be guided. There was a desultory discussion for a few minutes, Hon. Mr. Gibson remarking that the report stated the places in which the evidence was taken, and that the witnesses were prominent men in their places of residence, and, further, that the witnesses in their evidence nearly always stated their experience and occupation. Mr. Howland observed that no Deputy Registrar had given evidence, and Sir Oliver Mowat responded that none had volunteered evidence, and that no one had suggested that such evidence would be necessary. Mr. Kerns then dropped his motion.

MUNICIPAL INDEBTEDNESS.

An interesting municipal topic was then touched upon by Mr. Gibson of Huron, who moved for a return which as finally passed was for an order for a return showing the municipal indebtedness of the various municipalities of the Province on the 31st December, 1894, under the following heads:—(1) Roads and bridges; (2) railway bonuses; (3) aid to manufactures by way of bonus; (4) municipal waterworks; (5) waterworks belonging to companies; (6) gas and electricity; (7) High and Public Schools; (8) account of sewers; (9) other purposes, also showing any debenture debt for local improvement not included in the above.

Mr. Gibson made a number of valuable observations upon this topic, drawing attention to the alarming increase in this species of indebtedness. The latest statistics indicated a municipal indebtedness of about sixteen and a half millions, but he was inclined to think the actual amount much higher, as there has been great laxity in the keeping of accounts by the municipalities. There had been for some years a large number of applications from municipalities, Mr. Gibson observed, to consolidate their debt, and that meant a continuance for 20 or 30 years more. The bonus system came in for condemnation, and Mr. Gibson made a sharp reference to the practice, which he regarded as fully as bad, of exempting manufacturers from taxation. Toronto he regarded as a great offender in this respect, and as to some extent the cause of bonusing in smaller places. One suggestion which he threw out was the appointment of a Provincial Auditor, who should audit the accounts of the municipalities, as is done in Great Britain. This, he thought, would be a salutary check upon extravagance.

An informal discussion followed, which resulted in some verbal changes and the addition at Mr. Howland's suggestion of a question as to the debt for local improvement purposes. Mr. Matheson suggested a further line of inquiry in the amounts now owing, which should have been paid by the sinking fund, but it was thought by Hon. Mr. Gibson that this might lessen the accuracy of the rest of the return. The return was finally passed as before given.

Two public bills received their second

readings—Mr. Haycock moved for a municipal act, with respect to the payment of arbitrators' fees, and Mr. Wood's, to amend the municipal act with reference to the position of transient traders, and then the House adjourned at a few minutes to 4 o'clock.

RETURNS BROUGHT DOWN.

Hon. Mr. Gibson laid on the table the annual report of the Inspector of Division Courts, which is a voluminous mass of figures, giving the statistics of the business done in the various parts of the Province. A return ordered at the request of Mr. Haggerty was laid on the table, giving particulars as to the number of registrations during the last ten years in the various municipalities of Hastings.

Another return was laid on the table which was ordered at the instance of Mr. Evanturel, relating to correspondence as to warrants issued in one Province and to be endorsed in another. The correspondence is between Mr. L. J. Cameron, Assistant Attorney-General of Quebec, and the Attorney-General's Department of Ontario, and is with reference to a number of refusals on the part of Ontario Justices of the Peace to endorse Quebec warrants. One charge is that Police Magistrate Ogara of Ottawa refused to endorse a warrant made out by High Constable Bissonnette of Montreal; and Mr. J. N. Greenshields, Q.C., of Montreal, also complains that he failed to get an endorser of a warrant issued against one McCarrigle, who ultimately escaped. Mr. Ogara's reply is that the warrant being in French he asked for a translation, and that while he was getting the translation done High Constable Bissonnette found that the man would come with him without trouble, so that he did not need any endorsement. Mr. Thomas Mitchell, J.P., of Pembroke, also complained of the charge being that he refused to assist in the arrest of a man charged with exposing goods for sale as a peddler without a license; his defence is that the offence as stated in the warrant was no offence under Ontario laws, and that he declined to take the responsibility of causing the man's arrest under such circumstances.