

did. No one who looked at the question candidly could vote for the resolution submitted by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MERRICK had no doubt that nearly all the members of the House were surprised to find that scarcely any reduction had been made in the estimates. In speaking he would refer only to the figures quoted by hon. members opposite. The Treasurer, in his Budget speech, had given very full details, and had candidly answered any questions put to him. The Treasurer admitted that the surplus on hand after the Sandfield Macdonald Government was \$3,704,733, not including amounts held by the Dominion Government. These special funds were now claimed by the Government as part of their surplus, but the former Government were entitled to credit for the same. These amounted to \$2,703,557, and the value of the library at Ottawa was \$105,541,000, a total surplus after the late administration of \$6,542,825. The surplus as claimed by the present Treasurer was \$4,531,362. It was questionable whether the Government had really saved this. The money of Sandfield Macdonald's Government was not from what might be called abnormal revenues, except perhaps a sum of \$118,000 from the timber lands sale of 1871. The Government had made \$600,000 out of the sale of '73, and \$76,000 out of the sale of '77. The Government could not take credit for that as part of the surplus. They might as well claim the proceeds of the sale of any of the public buildings for the same. The Sandfield Macdonald Government had to pay \$291,000 interest on the debt of the Province, which was struck off by the Tilley Act. The present Government claimed credit for having arranged the municipal loan fund, but he claimed that an injustice had been done to the older municipalities who had not borrowed from that fund. He then proceeded to quote the Public Accounts to show that the average annual increase during the present Administration had been 35 per cent greater than under the former Government. He took up first the subject of legislation, showing that there was a difference in the increase of 40 per cent under the present Government over the former, following it with similar remarks upon the maintenance of public institutions, in which department also he claimed a large relative increase. The Government had likewise increased the expenditure set down to administration of justice in an unwarrantable manner. During the four years of John Sandfield's administration the average yearly increase had been five per cent, while the present Administration had increased the same item at the rate of forty per cent. By similar calculations he went on to show that the Government were responsible for undue increases in other departments. Yet he did not see how they could claim credit for having given so much money back to the people, since a large amount of the expenditure had been upon works which would give no return to the majority of the people. He asserted that nearly all the items of salaries and contingencies in the different departmental offices had been increased, and the course of the Opposition with regard to these increases was embodied in the resolution before them. He gave figures relating to the various offices in support of his statement, but was corrected in some of them by members of the Government. He thought there should be no hesitation in reducing the salaries of many officials, since if they did not like to accept the lower salary, efficient men could be found who would do so. The Opposition had urged upon the Government the necessity of decreasing the expenditure in many directions, and they would always be willing to concur in any such decrease.

Mr. BAXTER thought the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers were in the habit of paying much deference to the views expressed by gentlemen outside of the House. The tables and statements of Hon. Senator Macpherson seemed to be of much service to them. The expenditure under the present Government had been large, but it had not been a wasteful expenditure; it was all in the interests of the country. The supporters of the Government were prepared to defend the increases made by them in the expenditure on the ground that the money belonged to the people, and that it had been distributed so as to benefit them. Notwithstanding the large amounts which had been paid out by the Government the surplus was still large,

amounting to four and a half millions of dollars, and the Province was in a sound state financially.

Mr. FRASER characterized the motion introduced by the leader of the Opposition as "buncombe." The term might not be a parliamentary one, but still he used it advisedly in describing not only the present motion, but the whole course of the Opposition during the session. They had acted as if they wished to condemn the Government for what they themselves had consented to, and their whole course of action was intended to gain political capital for them. The leader of the Opposition had in his motion set forth comparisons in different items of expenditure under the present and late Governments, and these comparisons were made unfairly to tell against the Administration. The hon. gentleman had pursued a similar plan in his speech, for which he (Mr. Fraser) had corrected him before. In comparing the expenditures of the two Governments, he (Mr. Meredith) had charged such abnormal items of expenditure incurred by the late Administration as the relief to sufferers by the Ottawa fire, and others of a like nature, to capital account; but when he came to the sum spent by the present Administration in consolidating and revising the statutes, he had set it down as an item of current expenditure. The hon. gentleman should have treated both cases alike, and not have classed them under different headings. He (Mr. Fraser) could say with confidence that every member on the Government side of the House was in favour of economy in administering the affairs of the Province, and he thought the electors would testify their confidence in the Administration by returning a large majority to support them at the coming election. (Cheers.)

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

Before recess Mr. Hardy laid on the table the following documents:—

1. The case of the Ontario Government before the boundary arbitration.
2. Dominion Order in Council relating to the same.
3. Descriptive pamphlet of new territory added to Ontario under the award of the same.
4. Report of Commissioner of Crown Lands.
5. Separate School return.

After recess,

Mr. FRASER resumed the debate on the motion to go into Committee of Supply. After referring to the points he had maintained he stated that just before the adjournment for recess he had characterized the motion as buncombe. He had now to characterize it in another way. Usually with votes of want of confidence, where the leadership was courageous, where there was something manly about it, a Government was not attacked in the dark. Those bringing forward such motions generally gave some notice of their intention, particularly in cases like the present, where the resolution would make it impossible to express by motion a difference of opinion, and where it had to be a straight vote. This was done in order to give the Government a chance of defence. In view of the fact that this was a straight vote, he considered that he was justified in characterizing the leadership under which this motion was made as small and narrow—that there was not much courage or manliness about it—that the strategy might be characterized as ten cent strategy. (Laughter.) Fair and honest leadership would give the opponents an opportunity to prepare a defence. When one seeks to make a comparative statement as between one year and another, the least to be expected is that those who are to criticize the statement should have an opportunity of knowing where he gets his figures and how he reaches the conclusions he draws from them. He had only in part been able to ascertain how the hon. leader of the Opposition reaches the comparative statement between 1871 and 1877. He thought he had shown that the figures did not appear as represented in the Public Accounts, and therefore the hon. gentleman could not expect his own followers, if they were true to themselves, to vote for his resolution. He would place his followers in the position of supporting figures which they knew to be incorrect and endorsing statements which did not square with truth. (Hear, hear.) The speech of the hon. gentleman