

## Financial Statement Still Further Debated.

### QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

#### Retrenchment Suggested by a Patron Member.

Mr. McKay of Victoria and Mr. McDonald Discuss the Budget—Work of Committees.

Friday, Feb. 28.

The House did a quantity of miscellaneous work this afternoon, clearing the order paper of a number of items, and hearing a couple of speeches in the budget debate, which is now nearing a conclusion. To-day it was Messrs. McKay of Victoria and McDonald of Centre Bruce who spoke, each approaching the subject from the standpoint of their special familiarity with certain departments of the Government's activity. Mr. McKay spoke of the policy of the Government in the newer districts of Ontario, maintaining strongly that it has been the reverse of extravagant in its dealings there, and Mr. McDonald, speaking as a Patron, made a number of comments upon the Government's expenditure upon education and agriculture, and proposed a number of measures of retrenchment.

#### QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

In reply to a question by Mr. Marter as to what was the average cost per year for each prisoner at the Central Prison for the years 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895 for provisions and clothing, also the average earnings for each of same years of each prisoner, Hon. Mr. Gibson replied that the average yearly cost per prisoner for clothing had been, in 1891, \$10 36; in 1892, \$13 69; in 1893, \$12 92; in 1894, \$11 80; and in 1895, \$12 49. The average yearly cost for provisions was, in 1891, \$42 60; in 1892, \$40 28; in 1893, \$38 02; in 1894, \$28 52; and in 1895, \$26 70. The average yearly earnings per prisoner were, in 1891, \$37 28; in 1892, \$23 46; in 1893, \$62 37; in 1894, \$29 18; and in 1895, \$68 74.

In reply to a further question by Mr. Marter, Hon. Mr. Gibson stated that Mr. James Massie has been appointed Registrar of East and West York, his commission being dated January 23. Dr. John T. Gilmour was appointed Warden of the Central Prison on January 22 last.

In reply to a further question by Mr. Marter, the Provincial Secretary stated that Mr. Massie's commission had been issued and sent to Mr. Massie.

In response to a question by Mr. Brower, Mr. Gibson stated that Mr. Dugald Campbell, formerly farmer at the London Asylum, was appointed in April, 1890, and had served for five or six years, retiring with a gratuity of \$225, as was customary. He was not a pensioner.

Mr. Preston asked: Who is P. Jamieson, whose name appears in the Public Accounts for \$6,000 in 1895? What is the nature of the claim for which he received such a consideration?

Hon. Mr. Harcourt said:—Mr. P. Jamieson is lessee of the old Agriculture and Arts Association lot on the corner of Queen and Yonge streets. The claim for which he received consideration was: (1) as lessee under the Agriculture and Arts Association under an unexpired lease; (2) under an agreement between him and the Agriculture and Arts Association for the right to purchase the said premises.

The property came into the hands of the Government under the act of

last session abolishing the Agriculture and Arts Association. It was vacant, a fire having destroyed the building, and it was desirable either to lease or sell the property. In order to do either it became necessary to dispose of Mr. Jamieson's claim. It was afterward leased to him for a term of 21 years at \$4,000 per year, upon conditions as to the erection of buildings, etc., and he is now the tenant at that rental, he having held it under a lease from the Agriculture and Arts Association, under which he paid from \$1,800 to \$2,000 per year.

Dr. Willoughby moved for an order of the House for a return giving names of all applicants for the position of Registrar of Brant and of Wentworth, the dates of all applications, the names of appointees and dates of their appointment.

Sir Oliver Mowat replied that such applications were confidential, and that the Government consequently could not consent to the motion.

Dr. Willoughby said that he was asking only for names and dates, not for the correspondence, but Sir Oliver Mowat said that he could not consent, and the motion was declared lost on a division.

### QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

The orders of the day were called, and Mr. Beatty of Leeds rose on a question of privilege to explain that in a morning newspaper a passage in his speech on the budget debate had been made to read that he advocated the surveying of timber limits in blocks of one mile or twelve miles. It should have been in blocks of six miles or twelve miles.

Rising to a question of privilege, Mr. Marter referred to a statement in this morning's Globe to the effect that he had withdrawn certain statements he made in regard to a speech by Mr. Davis, in which he referred to the surplus. The speech he referred to yesterday, he said, was one reported in The Globe, delivered by Mr. Davis some time ago. Mr. Davis had explained that certain things in the speech had been omitted, and in view of that he (Mr. Marter) had accepted the explanation. But he certainly could not see how it could be said that he had to withdraw anything he had said.

Mr. Davis—The hon. gentleman in his speech yesterday tried to make it appear that I was deceiving the public. I said to him that my speech was not fully reported, and if it had been fully reported the other part was not read, and he accepted my explanation that I did not try to deceive anyone on that matter.

Mr. Marter—Allow me to say, I simply must stand by my remarks of yesterday so far as my impression of his speech goes. The report read:—"Speaking of the Government, he said, the Government began in 1867 with a clean sheet and now have a surplus of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000." I do not think that anything said afterwards could mean what was said in The Globe. Therefore it is incorrect to say that I was obliged to take back what I said.

Hon. Mr. Ross said he thought the hon. gentleman was rather abusing the privilege in declining to take the statement of an hon. member of the House. The member for North York (Mr. Davis) had said that statement did not represent what he said. The hon. leader of the Opposition should have accepted that explanation. It was quite possible for a reporter in the midst of a multitude of points to make a slight omission. Mr. Davis had stated twice what he believed he had said. That was stronger than the word of any newspaper reporter. It grieved him very much that Mr. Marter would not accept the explanation of the member for North York.

Mr. Whitney said he could say positively that what Mr. Marter had said was: That as far as the hon. gentleman on the other side had been misrepresented he cheerfully accepted his statement.

Hon. Mr. Ross said he understood the leader of the Opposition did not read into that report. He would accept the statement of the two gentlemen opposite regarding Mr. Marter's exception.

Mr. Marter—The exception I ask today is this: To The Globe newspaper saying that by an explanation made I was obliged to take back, to withdraw, statements by me. I say that is unfair, very unfair. They should simply have said that the member for North York made a statement which I accepted.

The matter was then allowed to drop.