

were the most convincing proofs of the carefulness with which these estimates were framed. He then explained how and under what circumstances these over-expenditures occurred. He referred indignantly to the remarks of the previous speaker upon their having exceeded the grant to cover the expenditure in representing Ontario suitably at Philadelphia, and said that the manner in which Ontario had been represented had claimed the admiration of other countries which were sending their thousands for our dollars.

Mr. FRASER said that the Opposition had during their term of office rather a novel plan of keeping their books. If they appropriated \$20,000 for public buildings, and expended \$60,000, they did not charge this to unforeseen and unprovided, but dipped into the Treasury, with no constitutional sanction good, bad, or indifferent. The only expenditure charged to unforeseen and unprovided was that kind of expenditure for which there was no grant. He analyzed the expenditure of the past Administration, and showed that the expenditure under what properly came under unforeseen and unprovided exceeded by a considerable sum that asked by the present Administration.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said that whenever an objection was made to an action of the Government the hon. gentlemen offered the excuse that they had the precedent supplied by the previous Government. He considered this rather inconsistent, considering that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had condemned the previous Government for violating the constitution. That being the case, the Government could not justify themselves by referring to the action of the previous Government. He did not believe in making close estimates if the money was expended under another head. The sum for this special appropriation should, however, be reduced to the lowest possible point, as it was unwise to vote a large sum *en bloc*, to be expended at the discretion of the Government. He was, therefore disposed to move a reduction of the item. In referring to the large expenditure in connection with the Centennial Exhibition, he did not think the country would feel inclined to endorse it. The appropriation need not have been exceeded, and there was no justification for the over-expenditure. He considered that the vote in this question should be given irrespective of party, and as it was extremely undesirable to give an independent opinion on items of supply. He moved in amendment that the resolution be not concurred in, but that the said sum be reduced to \$20,000, so that the large sum of \$50,000 may not be left to be expended at the sole direction of the Executive Government.

Mr. MILLER pointed out that the Centennial Exhibition was one for the whole world, and the Canadian exhibit attracted the attention of all countries, and the effect had already benefited the trade of the country. But for that exhibition, Canada would have remained unknown to many countries, or been contended with the United States. It was impossible to foresee the exact expenditure in connection with such an exhibition. He considered that the sum spent was very small. (Hear.) Canada was now looked upon as one of the commercial countries of the world. Hon. gentleman opposite laid great stress on the over-expenditure, but said nothing about the \$204,000 unexpended.

Mr. CURRIE pointed out that under the present Government the unforeseen and unprovided covered not only items chargeable to this fund, but also excess of appropriation. Last year the sum expended on "unforeseen and unprovided" proper was only \$3,000, the balance being for excess of appropriation.

Mr. CAMERON contended that it was the energy of the mechanics of the country that caused Canada to make so creditable a display at the Philadelphia Exposition, and not the \$15,000 of the Government. The Treasurer, in his former speech, said that the Government proposed only to take charge of the departments at the exhibition which were not undertaken by the Dominion Government, viz., the representation of art and the mineral resources of the country. Notwithstanding this, the supporters of the Government were claiming credit for the whole display.

Mr. BALLANTYNE considered that a Government that could not be trusted with the expenditure of \$50,000, ought not to be trusted with the administration of the affairs of the country. He should therefore vote for the original motion. With regard to the expenditure for the Centennial Exhibition, he believed that it was impossible to

exactly estimate it. In illustrating the benefits derived from the Canadian display, he pointed out that it proved to the world that Canadian cheese was superior to that of the United States. This was admitted by Prof. Arnold, one of the jurors. He asked was this result of no benefit. It was true that the people supplied the materials for the Canada exhibit, but without Government assistance that exhibit would never have been made.

Mr. WOOD said the great object in exhibiting at the Centennial was to show to the world Canada's ability to pay whatever capital it drew from other sources, and so gain the confidence of British and other capitalists. No better way could have been taken for demonstrating this than by illustrating the commercial activity of the country. If the Government had spent twice the sum on this object they would have received the sanction of the people.

Mr. HODGINS showed that the average ratio the total expenditure bore to the volume of business in the years 1868 to 1871 was 8½ per cent, while in the years 1872-75, under the present Government, the ratio was 7½ per cent, or one per cent less than under the Administration of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald. These facts would show who were the best financiers. He moved in amendment to the amendment that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following inserted: "And the House is of opinion that the experience of former Governments shows that the sum asked for is required by the public service, the same be now granted."

Mr. FRASER cited the figures to prove his assertion that there had been a steady increase in 1871 over the expenditure in 1869. The only Department in which there was a decrease was in the Crown Lands, and that he contended was accomplished through the dismissal of a large staff of useless officials.

Mr. LAUDER asserted that his statement was right, and said that the returns bore him out in saying that the expenditure when under the control of the Executive showed a decrease.

Mr. MACDOUGALL'S amendment being put to the House, it was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barr, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Cameron, Code, Coutts, Crighton, Deacon, Fleisher, Harkin, Kean, Lauder, Long, McDonnell (Middlesex), Macdonnell (Simcoe), McRae, Merrick, Monk, Mostyn, Patterson (Que.), Pearson, Richardson, Rosevear, Scott, Tooley, Wigg, Willis—80.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Ballantyne, Barter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (North), Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Crooke, Currie, Dawson, De Roche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grange, Grant, Hardy, Hargrave, Hay, Hodsons, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McGowan, McMahon, Massey, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Paine, Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Steinhilber, Springer, Striker, Watterworth, Widdell, Williams, Wilson, Wood—49.

The resolution was then carried.

On the motion of Mr. Mowat the Speaker left the chair at 11:05 p.m.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION.

Attorney-General Mowat gives notice of a Bill to amend the Temperance Act, 1864.

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 14.

This Committee met at 10 a.m. Mr. Clarke (Wellington) in the chair.

John Morrison, wholesale grocer, being sworn, deposed:

To Mr. Lauder—We first supplied the Government in 1875; Mr. Langmuir first came into our store; the first order for the Central Prison was for \$147; in 1875 we supplied \$634.69 to the Central Prison, which was all ordered by Mr. Short, Barrister; we supplied first in 1875 to the Lunatic Asylum; Mr. Langmuir came into our store; I did not know him; I did not see Mr. Wood or any member of the Government on the subject of supplies; I think we sent goods in December last to Orillia; no other place outside of Toronto to my knowledge; I think Mr. Langmuir always buys personally when the order is over a few hundred dollars; the total amount of our sales for 1875 to the Government was \$4,590.18; for 1876, \$5,509.76.

To the Chairman—We never solicited the account at all; a cash buyer could not have done any better by us than the Government did.

To Mr. Gibson—I don't think that the Government would be supplied cheaper by contracting at the beginning of the season at fixed prices for what would be required; groceries have no regular brands; I take the Govern-