

inference which he had asked them to draw in regard to the probable income. In 1869, the actual income, after paying all Dominion charges, was \$2,333,512, which exceeded the estimate. In 1870, the receipts were \$2,209,029, falling short of the estimates of that year by nearly half a million, arising from the receipts of the Crown Lands Department having fallen below the estimate. In 1871 the receipts were \$2,333,179, while the estimate was \$2,660,538, showing a falling off from the estimate of upwards of \$300,000. In 1872 the receipts were \$3,060,749, an excess over the estimate of \$436,685. In regard to the actual receipts from woods and forests in 1871 and 1872 there was this difference. In 1871 the amount received from woods and forests was \$246,983, while in 1872 the amount was \$973,239, a difference of \$726,256. In regard to the sale of timber berths in 1872 less than one-half of the amount realized by that sale was brought into the account of that year. A large portion of the amount from that source would appear in the accounts of the present year.

Mr. RYKERT asked if the notes given at the sale were included in last year's accounts.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said none whatever. He was speaking of actual cash. The amount received from the woods and forests branch included nothing but actual cash, which was placed to the credit of the Treasurer of the Department. In making payments the amounts are deposited at the nearest points, in the banks, and are transferred to the Department; so that when he spoke of this \$9,973,000 being received from the woods and forest branch of the Department, he might say that less than \$300,000 of the proceeds of the sale was included in the amount.

Mr. RYKERT.—What is the exact amount.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS (after consultation with Hon. Mr. Scott) said that he found he had fallen into an error in consequence of the way in which the information was given in the public accounts of 1871. The public accounts, in statement I, showed the amount received from woods and forests at \$246,000. The Crown Lands sales were credited with \$403,000. Now, it appeared that these credits had been transposed, as his hon. friend the Commissioner had pointed out to him, so that the receipts should be the former figure. Of course it was impossible for him (Mr. Crooks) to do more than state to the House the information as he saw it stated.

Mr. RYKERT—You surely do not rely upon the printed accounts. There are many errors in them.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said these were probably only typographical errors. Hon. members would thoroughly understand that this large amount received by the Woods and Forests included less than a moiety of the results of the sale. This would be readily perceived when he mentioned the fact that in January, 1873, he had been enabled to add \$600,000 to the amounts already invested. In other words, the Treasurer in the first month of this year had so much of actual cash at his credit, over and above the demands made upon him from the Railway Subsidy Fund and other demands both current and as against capital, that he was enabled to add that sum to the amount of the investments.

Mr. RYKERT asked what was the amount received from the sale.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said that would be given to hon. gentlemen from the proper quarter and with proper explanations. Another guide which hon. members might take as to our expenditure, as with regard to our total income, might be found by an examination of the estimates as compared with the actual expenditure in some of these years, and hon. members would be gratified to know that in every instance there had been a less amount expended—in some years a considerable less amount—than the amount which was asked from the Legislature. In 1872 there was unexpended of the amount appropriated by the Legislature upwards of a half a million of dollars.

Mr. CAMERON said that to make that statement of any value they ought to know the items in which there was less expended than appropriated.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said that first of all he would give the gross results, and would go into details afterwards. If hon. gentlemen would turn to the public accounts of this year and the statement to be found on page 146 and closing at page 149 they would find the gross amounts. They would find that the

total amount of appropriation for the year 1872 was \$2,312,633, while the amount actually expended was \$540,817. Then in 1871 hon. members would find that the large sum of three-quarters of a million was unexpended. The appropriation for that year was \$2,581,560 while the amount expended was \$1,816,866. In 1870 the amount unexpended was \$450,383; in 1869 \$179,305. So that in none of those years had the actual expenditure reached the sum of two millions of dollars. Now, his hon. friend the member for Toronto had asked him to point out with respect to what particular services the amounts appropriated remained unexpended. In all of these unexpended items the public works involved as a rule the larger share. In 1872 the public works involved nearly 300,000; and so on in 1871. Both in 1871 and 1872 the amounts unexpended involved as much as \$300,000, but on several other items amounts less than the estimates had been expended. Now he would ask hon. members to follow him in arriving at a comparison between the actual position of the Province with reference to its assets on the 31st Dec. 1872, as compared with its position at the period in the preceding year. He asked them to see the improvement that had taken place in the position of the Province during the year just closed. On reference to the public accounts of 1872, hon. gentlemen would find that on the 31st of December, 1871, the Province had invested the sum of \$3,637,979; it had cash in the bank \$172,985; and up to that period it had expended in the creation of property of value in the Province—in other words, in erecting public works and buildings which were of the nature of permanent improvements, which would give to that extent an additional value to the works and buildings owned by the Province—of \$1,208,662, apart from expenditure which disappeared as it was expended, which had no corporeal representation, but which disappeared in a variety of ways, although it had added to the progress and well-being of the country and of many of its inhabitants. But in the shape of visible representation in respect to Provincial expenditure since 1867, they had this large sum which he had mentioned, and which, being added to the cash on hand and invested, amounted to \$5,019,627. In other words, the Province could clearly claim to own property and value in cash investments to the amount of five millions and upwards. Taking the 1st Dec., 1872, and looking at the position of the Province in that particular it would be found that the amount invested had increased to \$4,297,979, the details of which hon. gentlemen would find by reference to the public accounts of 1872—statement II, page 24; and that the cash in the Bank had increased to \$352,991.

Mr. CAMERON—That is cash in the Bank unproductive?

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said yes; that was an amount to be drawn against. Of course it was made productive afterwards, because he invested it in January. In addition to the expenditure on public works which he had mentioned, up to Dec. 31, 1871, there was an additional amount expended in 1872 of \$266,764, making the public works up to that year \$1,475,427. Beyond this amount, \$372,786 was paid in connection with the Railway Fund. Hon. gentlemen would understand that the amount which the Legislature thought fit to appropriate last session and the previous session in aid of railways had been carried by him to a distinct fund. In other words, the Legislature having appropriated \$1,900,000 for a specific purpose, he had carried that to a specific account, called the Railway Fund Account.

Mr. CAMERON asked if the money under this fund was drawing interest.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said that the only way in which the amount represented in the fund could be considered as drawing interest was by considering that a portion of the amount now invested, which might be called upon to answer the drafts on the Railway Fund, was the Railway Fund.

Mr. CAMERON—What I want to understand is, do you consider this as invested, and the interest accruing from that to go to swell the Railway Aid Fund.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS—We are not bound to add the interest.

Mr. CAMERON said then there was no necessity for making a separate account.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS said there was not, except to make a distinct fund. In connection with that, hon. gentlemen would see that \$372,786 of the receipts or incoming of last year was applied to meet drafts upon that fund. The Province was \$1,479,556 better off on the 31st Dec. '72 than it was on the 31st Dec. '71. He thought hon. members would not say that this was not a fair financial beginning for a Govern-