

Was the Letter Suppressed?

In supply Mr. Lucas (Centre Grey) repeated his statement regarding the letter which he had previously charged had been suppressed by the Provincial Secretary, or an official in his depart-

ment, and asked the Minister to give an explanation.

Hon. Mr. Stratton made a statement, in the course of which he read a letter from Mr. Korman, the clerk in charge of the correspondence in the department, which showed that the missing letter had been accidentally placed in the wrong file, and was only found after the name of the writer had been supplied by Mr. Lucas. Mr. Stratton said that his hon. friend had endeavored to mislead the House, and declared that if Mr. Lucas could prove what he said, the House would deal with any official who had been guilty of the offence charged. He recalled that in 1898 Mr. Lucas had similarly left a misleading impression, by declaring that a hotelkeeper, who had worked for him in Centre Grey, was at the time of speaking without a license, whereas he had not that year even applied for a license.

Mr. Lucas said the letter in question had been in its place two days before it was asked for in the House.

Mr. Stratton—How do you know?

Mr. Lucas—I am not bound to answer, but I may say that I walked into the department myself, asked to see the letters, and have here the original memorandum. (Ministerial laughter.)

Mr. Stratton—That is no doubt the occasion on which the letter was misplaced in being put back on the file. Read the letter.

What the Letter Was About.

Mr. Lucas said he had only a memorandum of the letter. It was written by the President of the Reform Association at Durham, and stated that public opinion there was all in favor of giving a license to a certain hotel, but that the defeated Liberal candidate having been committed to another hotel, the commissioners had acted at his direction.

Hon. Mr. Latchford said that did not prove the charge at all.

Mr. Whitney—Many a man has been hung on no stronger evidence than that.

Hon. Mr. Gibson said he had never heard of a more flimsy sort of case.

Hon. Mr. Harcourt—The clerk showed my hon. friend the letter. That is how it was suppressed. (Ministerial cheers.)

The matter then dropped.

Figures Out a Deficit.

Col. Matheson said he desired to present his statement of the financial outlook, which he had intended to give in the discussion on the amendment. The main estimates were \$4,004,228; the first supplementaries, \$181,947; further supplementaries, \$3,750; railway certificates, \$92,248; annuities, \$102,900; total, \$4,385,073. The estimated receipts were \$4,075,872, leaving an estimated deficit of \$309,201, while \$200,000 of the estimated receipts were a balance of the bonus on the timber sale of last year.

Hon. Mr. Gibson said the Province had often commenced a year with an estimated deficit and ended with a surplus.

Supplementaries Passed.

The supplementaries, totalling \$184,697.24, were passed. On the main estimates amendments were offered on the following items held over:—Mr. Thompson (Centre Simcoe), \$600 for table allowance for Superintendent of Reformatory for Boys; Dr. Barr (Dufferin), \$1,000 for increases of salaries of officials at the same institution. Both were declared lost on division, as was also Col. Matheson's motion against the reformatory for boys being removed to Oxford. There were no discussions on these amendments.

The House adjourned at 12.15.

March 13/02