

## LACKS SOME DATA; ANSWER DELAYED.

### No Power Explanation From Premier Whitney Yet.

### A PROMISE FOR TO-DAY.

### Opposition Demands Facts Be- fore Any Discussion.

### Government Attempt to Find Out Reasons Why Liberals Wanted In- formation, and Failed—One Re- turn Made Regarding Motion Made Last Session—The Legislature Yesterday.

Mr. Whitney did not give his promised explanation with regard to the Electrical Development Company at yesterday's session of the Legislature. He stated that there were certain matters which required a lengthy explanation based on information he had not up to that time received. The Premier promised, however, to answer the questions, placed on the order paper by the leader of the Opposition, to-day. In accordance with the arrangement made last week a return was laid on the table showing what the Hydro-electric Commission had really accomplished. Before the return was finally put in there was a little fencing between the Hon. Adam Beck, the Premier and Mr. MacKay. The Ministers desired to know what Mr. MacKay wanted the information for and what he intended to do with it, but the only comfort they got was of a cold nature, conveyed in the statement that the leader of the Opposition preferred to know the facts before he proceeded to discuss them. A second return, brought down as the result of a motion made last session, showed that a large number of Division Court Clerks and Bailiffs had been removed from office for "improper partisanship."

The Premier also mentioned the redistribution bill, which, he said, would be dealt with by a committee of eight. He added that a large number of constituencies would not be changed at all, and that the proposed changes were decreasing in number.

### Information Wanted First.

The Hon. A. G. MacKay moved for a return showing the work accomplished by the Hydro-electric Commission.

Hon. Mr. Beck pointed out that no reason was given for the return being made. They had worked day and night on it, doing in two or three days the work of two or three weeks.

Hon. Mr. MacKay said the questions were asked simply for information, though the first question, he admitted, entailed more work than he had really intended, but the remainder of the questions only required the procedure gone through with the various municipalities dealt with by the commission.

Mr. Whitney stated that the rule was that reasons should be given before the return was made. He also expressed surprise because he was bound to feel "that there is no suggestion made as to what interest there is in these things being given to the public, and no suggestion made as to what use is to be made of it, and no suggestion made as to why the information should be granted at all."

Hon. Mr. MacKay said they wanted the information to ascertain where they were at, and he was prepared to discuss the question after he had obtained the facts. He reminded the Government that the Province had paid \$75,000 for the information.

Hon. Mr. Beck replied that the Oppo-

sition had wanted \$10,000 set aside for investigations regarding producer gas, and they had made their investigations for one-quarter of that amount.

The return was laid on the table.

Hon. Mr. Whitney stated that his reply to the Liberal leader's question with regard to negotiations between the Government and the bondholders of the Electrical Development Company would have to stand until to-day, as some of the information required had still to be obtained.

### Redistribution Questions.

Hon. Mr. MacKay next asked about the proposed redistribution bill, to which the Premier responded that it was an entirely new measure.

"The great majority of constituencies will be unchanged," said the Premier, who added that a special committee would be appointed, composed of eight members, three of whom would be from the Opposition probably. The bill was in course of preparation now, though the number of changes were decreasing.

The leader of the Opposition inquired if it were to be based on the 1901 census.

"We have had nothing authoritative since then," replied Mr. Whitney. "Of course we are not bound by anything except that which is reasonable, yet the census is the basis in most cases."

### Referees' Expenses.

On the motion of Mr. McMillan (Glen-garry) a return was brought down showing the number of cases tried by drainage referees, with the expenses outside of referees' salaries. The return was as follows:—

Colonel J. B. Rankin, Chatham—1900, 16 cases, \$1,150 expenses; 1901, 26 cases, \$1,262 expenses; 1902, 30 cases, \$1,660 expenses; 1903, 29 cases, \$1,514 expenses; 1904, 24 cases, \$1,615 expenses; 1905, 23 cases, \$1,425 expenses; 1906, 42 cases, \$1,203 expenses; 1907, 44 cases, \$1,324 expenses. George F. Henderson, Ottawa—1906, 5 cases, \$197 expenses; 1907, 24 cases, \$700 expenses.

Mr. McElroy (Carleton) gave notice of a bill to amend the act respecting the office of Sheriff in Carleton county, allowing the office to be closed at 1 o'clock on Saturdays. Other notices of motion were: To amend the fish and game act, Mr. Hoyle; to amend the ditches and watercourses act, Mr. Hoyle; to amend the franchise act, Mr. Smith (Peel); to amend the assessment act, Mr. Preston (Brant).

### Is He Electioneering?

Mr. Smith (Sault Ste. Marie) has given notice of the following inquiries of the Ministry:—Is J. Russell McGregor, who is license commissioner for the district of Manitoulin and also revising officer for the voters' lists in that district for the Ontario Government, the same J. Russell McGregor who is acting and active Secretary of the Conservative Association for Manitoulin, and who has called the Conservative convention for that constituency? Is R. R. McKissock, barrister, now of Sudbury, still Treasurer of the district of Manitoulin? If not, who is?

### A Comparison Wanted.

Mr. Smith (Sault Ste. Marie) has given notice of motion asking for a return showing the number of bridges built by the present Government over the Spanish and Sauble Rivers; where the bridges cross said rivers and the appropriations made for each. Also for a return showing the amounts expended on the colonization roads in the district of Manitoulin during 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively.

### They Were Partisans.

The Provincial Secretary laid a return on the table showing that between Feb. 7th, 1905, and Feb. 1st, 1907, 64 Division Court clerks resigned and 37 were removed from office. Of the last named number 34 were dismissed for improper partisanship, three on the report of the inspector, one as a defaulter, and one on being convicted for assault. Between Feb. 7th, 1905, and Feb. 1st, 1907, 91 Division Court bailiffs have resigned and 54 have been removed from office. The reason given for the removal of 44 of these is improper partisanship, two for inefficiency, two for incompetency, one for old age and drinking habits, three on report of inspector, one for violation of the law, and one in the "public interest."