

mation went there was no reason why that estimate should not be correct. That amount would maintain the average revenue of the past years from that particular source. The figures on which the estimate of \$588,000 revenue for 1876 from the Crown Lands Department was based were the following:—The Assistant Commissioner reported that he anticipated the receipts as follows:—Crown lands, \$75,000; Grammar School lands, \$8,000; clergy lands, \$30,000; Common School lands, \$45,000; woods and forests, \$430,000; and that estimate was prepared under instructions from him (Mr. Crooks) that it should be under rather than over the mark. The expenditure, then, for 1876 was, by the present estimates, \$2,135,245. Of course there would be some additions made by supplementary estimates. It was not possible, nor was it always proper, to bring down the entire estimates at that early period of the session. Additional expenditures were often rendered necessary in consequence of the legislation of the session, and those amounts had to be included in supplementary estimates. For example, if additional asylum accommodation was to be provided in compliance with the reference contained in his Honour's speech, an additional amount for the maintenance of those institutions would have to be provided. There were some items which would appear in the supplementary estimates, but the amount would not be considerable, and the House could safely count upon the sum being something about equivalent to that voted in the supplementary estimates in 1875. He might briefly refer to what the estimates for 1876 contained. As a rule, hon. members would find there were no considerable increases under the different heads of expenditure. There was a slight increase in respect to the expenses of government, \$5,000, on account of the additional number of members of the House. The increase of crime in this community and the gravity of the offences, in many cases, had caused a larger expenditure than formerly. The items for the maintenance of public institutions showed small increases. He next came to the subject of immigration, and the House would observe that the estimates for this year showed a reduction of \$49,000 as compared with those of last year. The amount proposed to be asked was \$79,000, as compared with \$121,800 last year. The items which gave rise to this decrease could be explained when they came to the discussion of the different items of this service, but the chief ground was pretty fully stated in the report of 1874 on immigration. The chief reason for the decrease arose from the change in the agencies under which this service was now being performed. The agency in Europe had been reduced to \$7,800 instead of \$13,000, and the agencies in Canada had also been reduced from \$45,000 to \$25,000. The reason for the former increase and the present decrease could be easily explained. Until the convention at Ottawa in 1871, he believed the Dominion Government defrayed almost the whole expense of the service, and none of the Provinces was directly instrumental in promoting immigration. The general office in London in charge of Mr. Dixon was the one in which all emigration efforts were promoted. The agencies in Quebec and other important points in Ontario were under the control of the Dominion Government, so that the Province of Ontario was relieved from spending much money in order to promote immigration; but the Dominion Government, on the representation of the other Provinces, found that Ontario was practically getting the lion's share—probably three-fourths of the immigrants. It thus became necessary for Ontario to submit to what the Dominion Government required, namely, that it should pay a portion of the charge of conveying immigrants from points in Quebec to points in Ontario, the expenses of the distribution of the immigrants when they arrived in Ontario, and the maintenance of the emigrant sheds here. This took place in 1871, and the operations of 1872 and 1873 were based upon that arrangement. Against that had to be set off the allowance of the Dominion Government, which one year voted \$70,000 to be divided among the Provinces in aid of immigration, \$25,000 of which came to Ontario. In 1872 the bonus system was introduced for the first time, and in 1872 and 1873 there were large expenditures under that head which the House thought it desirable to make. In 1872, \$25,000 was paid for this purpose, and in 1873 the large sum of \$73,000. It was necessary from time to time to make changes in the immigration system.

The bonus had fulfilled its purpose, and had the effect of attracting a large immigration to Ontario. We had strong competitors in New Zealand and other colonies in the matter of securing immigrants. It was a severe contest which Canada and Ontario were carrying on in promoting emigration here from the British Isles and Europe, and our only advantage lay in the short sea voyage and the comparative accessibility of Canada to those countries. There was no necessity for excessive competition or difficulties between the Provinces on that subject when they had one end to serve. Practically, a large amount of immigration would always seek Ontario, and there was no reason why this Province should assume responsibilities which had been assumed by the Dominion Government. It was only in those particulars in which Ontario could not escape bearing its quota of expenses that it would be called upon to provide for such. The accounts showed the payment to the Dominion Government for carrying immigrants to Ontario, and upon this Province devolved the duty of distributing them and maintaining them until they obtained employment. The Government took \$25,000 to use on the other side, if advantages offered, to assist the transportation of those emigrants who were recommended, and for whom the Dominion agent was responsible. The Immigration department was formerly a distinct department of the Government. That department had a very large amount of work to discharge on account of the numerous arrivals and the different claims made for bonus payments. The work of the department had, however, diminished under the new arrangement, so that the Commissioner in charge would be able, with the assistance of one clerk, to discharge all the duties which the requirements of the public service demand. The expenditure on the other side of the Atlantic has been restricted to that amount, which, under the arrangement with the Dominion Government, the Province had to pay. All that Ontario retained in England was a sub-agent in the Dominion office in London; so nothing remained except those particular items of expenditure which it was incumbent upon the Province to assume, having regard to its interests and the general desire to promote immigration. He would not trouble hon. members further on that point, for the details of the expenditures could be referred to. He would next refer to a subject on which he would be able to afford information which would enable the hon. member for East Grey to be more correct in his speeches on future occasions. That hon. member had charged the present Reform Government with extravagant expenditure, but he would, no doubt, agree that it was well that hon. members should possess some data on which to make their statements. His (Mr. Crooks') contention was that it did not follow that because the expenditure in any department of the public service during one year was greater than that during another year, extravagance should be attributed to the Government therefor. The true way of considering the question was to look at the extent of the business transacted, and then apply the test of the expenditure incurred in regard thereto. Let them consider the volume of receipts and expenditures and then consider the expenditure, and by such a comparison a basis would be provided either for a charge of extravagance or of efficiency. He denied entirely the charge of extravagance in reference to Civil Government. Let them take the years 1871 and 1873. Under the head of Civil Government, they would find the average per cent of cost having regard to the receipts was \$3 86, while on the receipts of 1873 it was \$3 87. Taking the expenditure from 1868 to 1871, they found the percentage to be \$5 63, while in 1872 and 1873 it was \$4 90, or, if they took into account the additional payments for the Railway Fund, \$4 10.

Mr. MERRICK—Why not 1873 and 1874, instead of 1872 and 1873?

Mr. CROOKS said he had not been able to bring it so far, but the calculation for the later years would be largely in his favour. The total expenditure for the four years from 1868 to 1871 inclusive amounted to \$6,023,000, or about a million and a half a year. In 1872 and 1873 they had about \$4,380,000, while the total salaries paid for the four years were \$339,000, and for the two years \$111,000. The expenditures in 1874 would show entirely in favour of the Government. The true principle on which to judge of economical management was the cost of the management as tested by the volume of the transactions.