

The department ought to be conducted on cash principles as speedily as might be, and by doing so, in this department alone there might be a saving to the country of some \$40,000 or \$50,000. At present the receipts and expenditure of the department bore no proportion. Taking into account the arrearages for a number of years past, the collections from old sales and new sales together, and he thought the expense of management would be found to be about 20 per cent. of the whole revenue.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS—No.

Mr. McKELLAR—The hon. gentleman denied this; but if he took the trouble to look back over the accounts for a number of years, he would find the statement correct. He (Mr. McKellar) did not rise to oppose the item. He merely rose to direct the attention of the Government to the necessity of wiping off the old arrearages and commencing on the cash system.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS was free to admit the justice of many of the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell. The selling of lands on credit necessarily involved a large additional expense to the country in keeping accounts. But in the condition of the country in times gone by, it would have been impossible to have adopted the cash principle, and make the Crown Lands a source of revenue. He could only state, in respect to the future, that it was the intention of the Government, as soon as possible, to set about making up lists of all the Crown Land arrearages; and at the next session, if the work of the Provincial arbitrators were completed, the Government might finally dispose of much of this matter. With regard to the working expenses of the department, they had been already reduced by the dismissal of four clerks, and would be kept as low as was consistent with the due discharge of the work.

In reply to Mr. Blake,

Hon. Mr. RICHARDS stated the revenue from timber to be about \$200,000.

The item carried.

On the next item left over, \$57,400 for indemnity of members, 82 at \$5 per diem—

Mr. McKELLAR said that this item was put up to its present amount, on the understanding that there was to be another session this year. He did not see how Government arrived at that conclusion. But it appeared they were to have another session in November or December next. Now he (Mr. McKellar) protested against the calling of the Legislature to meet at that time. It would suit the convenience of those gentlemen of the Cabinet who had seats in the Dominion Parliament, but it was almost the most inconvenient season that could have been chosen for the remaining 79 members of the House. If any additional argument were needed to show the injustice worked by the dual system, it was here supplied—if an additional reason were needed to show why this dual system should be done away with.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—But it was not proposed to do away with it, by the measure alluded to, for four years. (Hear).

Mr. McKELLAR need hardly tell the hon. Treasurer that in the event of a vacancy occurring, it might be done away with in that case long before the expiration of the 4 years. (Hear). He found too by the estimates that Ministers not only drew their salaries but also their indemnity of \$5 per day. Now, in all conscience, drawing good salaries ought to suffice the Administration, without drawing indemnity too. He did not know that Ministers deserved very much consideration at the hands of honourable members in relation to this matter. How was it, he would ask, that a measure on mineral lands and measures on other important subjects requiring immediate legislation, had not been brought down by the Government? Because, when they should have been engaged in discussing and framing these measures, they were canvassing the country from one end to the other, electioneering against their opponents. And here they came down and asked the country to pay them for these very peregrinations! If, instead of ranging up and down the country tomahawking every man having independence enough to differ with them—if, instead of doing this, they had been at work in their offices—there would not have been such a dearth of Government measures, and honourable gentlemen opposite would have done something which would give them a title to draw salaries for the period alluded to. There was the Commissioner of Public Works, a gentleman to whom he (Mr. McKellar) was indebted for two weeks of valuable services. But it so happened the hon. gentleman's labours went for nothing.

Hon. Mr. CARLING—To which county do you refer?

Mr. McKELLAR—Both counties. Then there was the Attorney General, drawing some \$12 or \$13 a day, and spending his time electioneering, ably backed up by the Commissioner of Public Works at \$10 a day—the latter having spent at least one month of