

estimated the expenditures from 1872 to 1874 or from Confederation to the present time. The amount collected in 1862 from the various branches was \$1,006 012. The cost of collecting this amount then was 17 per cent, while the cost of collection from 1872 to 1875 was only about 10 per cent. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman had stated that the whole expense in 1862 was something like \$70,000. Would the House believe that the expenditure for departmental salaries alone in that year was \$77,966. For contingencies the expenditure was \$22,813—(cheers); for settlements of roads (free grants), \$6,892; for inspection of agencies, \$2,831—(hear, hear); agents' commissions, \$15,074; postages of agencies, \$532; Crown advertisements, \$6 272—(cheers); general disbursements, \$8,896; and woods and forests, \$27,392. He was aware that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdougall) had also charge of the fisheries and other departments at that time—(Mr. Lauder—Hear, hear)—but he had carefully excluded the collections made under these heads and the costs of the collections. (Cheers.) He thought the comparison was decidedly in favour of the present Government. As to the re-valuation of lands, he asserted that the Government had only made reductions in cases where the lands had been sold at too high a price, and claimed that they were entitled to the thanks of the country for having given full effect to the statute. Men who would have left the country because of the accumulation of debt were now satisfied citizens with their deeds in their pockets. (Cheers.) He challenged the hon. gentleman to say that the measure had not worked admirably and proved a great blessing to the country. (Cheers.)

Mr. MACDOUGALL said that the present Attorney-General was one of his colleagues when the alleged excessive expenditures were made in 1862.

Mr. MOWAT—Not till 1863. (Laughter.)

Mr. MACDOUGALL said the Attorney-General entered the Government knowing what had been done. (Laughter.) Looking at the history of the Crown Lands Department since Confederation, and the great increase in the yearly expenditure, especially since the present Government took office, even though the business was decreasing, they charged the Government with not performing their duty in not proposing a reduction in the expenditure. He referred to regulations made by him when Commissioner of Crown Lands to show that large savings had been effected thereby, and read extracts from a report on the results of those reforms. In 1862, when he was a Reformer, he had received great credit for carrying out those modifications of the system, and it ill became Reformers to now bring up these acts at that time against him, occupying the position of an Independent member. It might fairly be expected that in the early years of the Department the expenses of management would be large, but now the expenditure should be reduced to a minimum. While the revenue of the Province was decreasing, the expenditure was rapidly increasing, and he saw no disposition on the part of the Government or of the House to effect savings in the administration of the public service. After commenting on the duties of the hon. members, the hon. member concluded by stating that he was sent to the House by a constituency of the Province to criticise the acts of the Government and to wash their expenditures. (Cheers.)

Mr. MOWAT said the Government desired their acts to be criticised, and he gave the hon. member for South Simcoe every opportunity to do so. It was doubtful whether that hon. member possessed the right to a seat in the Legislature, but recognizing him as a man of ability, who at one time rendered good service to the Reform cause, they desired to retain him in the House, and had introduced a Bill to remove any doubt as to his right to sit as the member for the Tory constituency which had returned him. If that hon. member was unable to find any ground for attack regarding the administration of the affairs of the Province by the present Government, they need not fear the attacks of other members of the Opposition. In regard to the argument that the expenditure of the Department immediately after Confederation was necessarily heavy, while that at the present time should be reduced to a minimum, it should be remembered that the Sandfield Macdonald Government was always considered the meanest of Governments and that the salaries of clerks under them were placed at the lowest scale. Great reductions could not, therefore, be expected to be made by the present Administration. But the hon. member for

South Simcoe assumed the position of Commissioner of Crown Lands as the successor of a Tory minister, and reductions were easily effected, for he had to clean an Augean stable. (Laughter.) Notwithstanding the efforts of the hon. Commissioner the expenditure was not reduced below 17 per cent. on the receipts, whilst the present Reform Government had brought it down to 10 per cent. (Cheers.) The amount for contingencies had been reduced from \$30,000 in 1862 to \$12,000 for the present year. As to the contention on the part of some members of the Opposition that they did not ask for a reduction of salaries, but for a general reduction, it was only necessary to point to the fact that, with the exception of \$12,000 contingencies, the whole sum of \$50,000 consisted of salaries. (Cheers.)

Mr. ROSS said that both parties had the same object in view, namely, to reduce the expenditure. Hon. members opposite had, however, forgotten that there was a considerable reduction in the amount asked for the coming year, as compared with that of last year. He had confidence in the administration of the Crown Lands Department. If a further reduction were made, and the lumber trade revived, the Commissioner would be obliged to exceed the appropriation. It would be more honest if the Opposition, instead of asking the House to appropriate only \$40,000, when the Commissioner asked \$50,000, proposed a direct vote of want of confidence in the Ministry. He was satisfied hon. members would not like the Crown lands managed as was done by the Sandfield Macdonald Government. The whole charge for stationery for that Department during one year of the Sandfield Macdonald Government was \$2. (Laughter.)

Mr. GIBSON showed that the promise had been made to the employees of the Departments by the late Government to increase their salaries, and that the present Government had only implemented that promise. The country wanted economical management, but desired to give a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. He defended the action of the Government in regard to the re-valuation of Crown lands, and disclaimed any charge of corruption in regard to that matter. It was easy to see that the re-valuation of the lands would involve an increased number of clerks, and the Commissioner had given the assurance that the number would be lessened as soon as possible. For his part, and he believed he spoke for a majority on this side of the House, he would continue to vote confidence in the Government until they had some more substantial charge against them than such buncombe resolutions as had been offered to-night, which dealt in vague generalities and came down to no specific details. (Cheers.)

Mr. LAUDER said he had never opposed the re-valuation of the poor lands, but he contended that the powers which the Bill had conferred upon the Government had been grossly abused. The old sales had been cancelled and the lands sold to favourites at low rates, and these afterwards sold them to settlers at large advances. The present Government did not deserve all the credit with regard to the Bill. The Commissioner had exceeded the appropriations of last year by about \$7,000, and that was his custom every year. The hon. member for North Huron would find that the appropriations would be exceeded next year.

Mr. SINCLAIR contended that Mr. Blake had taken the view that a reduction should be made in the interest on school lands, and it was owing to what Mr. Blake had said that the reduction had been made from six to four per cent. He had no doubt but there had been some cases in which improper reductions had been made in lands, but he believed these cases were few, and that furthermore the Commissioner could not be held responsible for them. As a rule he was confident that the intention of the Act had been carried out honestly. No impropriety he was sure could be charged to the head of the Department. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. CREIGHTON claimed that the question of reducing salaries was apart from the question at issue. The point was that there had been an annually decreasing amount of business, and an annually increasing amount of expense. He contended that altogether too large an amount was required in the shape of expenses for collecting the revenue of the Department, considering that the business was every year falling off. The expenses and the revenue should be proportionate.

Mr. FINLAYSON pointed out that for