

stated that in 1868 the ordinary expenditure was \$1,056,541, and in 1871 \$1,173,600, these being the first and last years respectively of the Macdonald Administration. What did the speaker mean by "ordinary expenditure"? If he meant expenditure payable out of revenue he had not used the correct term. If he had meant expenditure on capital account the phrase was wrong. Ordinary expenditure was that for which the Government came year by year before the people's representatives to ask them to vote the funds for. He claimed that the ordinary expenditure of 1868 was a hundred thousand dollars more than represented in this statement, and that 1871 was much higher than given. Ordinary expenditure did not include that made on account of surplus distribution, on account of the Railways Aid Fund, or other expenditures of a like nature, provision for which was made by special statutes, and which might all be spent in one year or otherwise, as the Government might see fit. The term used here was liable to be misconstrued by those in the country who read of it. Any ordinary reader taking up this resolution would be almost sure to misunderstand what was meant by ordinary expenditure. In that sense the resolution was manifestly unfair, incorrect, and calculated to mislead, and he dared venture to say that the concoctors of it—those who had the drawing of it—could not help but think so themselves, and knew the term would be misinterpreted in the country. If these figures had been correctly quoted they would not have been so favourable to hon. gentlemen opposite, and this had been their way of dealing throughout. Wherever a statement could be made to look unfavourable to the Government it was adopted, otherwise it was rejected. This had been done during two Parliaments. The Government were used to having special calculations of various merits brought in to show that they had exceeded the revenue, and that there was really no surplus. That it might not be said he was speaking against this simply because it was a motion of want of confidence, he would draw attention to its wording. First, the statement of the relative expenditures; then the regrets of the House at the present unwise expenditure, and then the words about direct taxation. They had here this bugaboo, this phantom, of direct taxation lugged in, just as if gentlemen opposite sought to convince the country that we were on the brink of its consummation. The hon. leader of the Opposition had stated that in 1883 the expenditure would be something like three and a half millions. He would like to know how the hon. gentleman arrived at that conclusion. He would like to have been at his elbow when he made his calculation, to see if he had calculated that future Parliaments would go on increasing indemnities and salaries as well as the increase in other expenses to reach such an enormous expenditure. His hon. friend he saw was laughing. He might well laugh for it was a very funny thing how such a result was to be brought about. Did his hon. friend who had moved the resolution really believe that there was a danger of the ordinary expenditure of the country going up to \$3,400,000 in 1883?

Mr. MEREDITH was understood to say that he did not, because the present Government would not then be in power.

Mr. FRASER said that predictions such as that his hon. friend had just made had often been made in the House before, and had proved to be unfounded, as the present one would prove. He noticed that the hon. member for West Toronto was on his feet; perhaps they would not see him there again. (Cheers.)

Mr. BELL made some remarks, which, on account of the confusion on the floor of the House, were inaudible in the gallery.

Mr. FRASER said he understood that the hon. gentleman challenged him to run against him in West Toronto.

Mr. BELL said he challenged the Hon. Minister of Education to run against him in West Toronto. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FRASER did not think that the hon. member for West Toronto ought to challenge any one to contest the election with him there, because the people of that constituency had given no sign that they wanted him again. (Cheers and laughter.) But if challenges were to be the order of the

day, he challenged the hon. leader of the Opposition to come down to South Grenville and run against him. (Hear, hear.) But he was going on to express his opinion that his hon. friend the member for London did not himself believe that there was any chance of the expenditure of the country increasing in the enormous ratio at which he had put it. If he did so he certainly could not have studied the Public Accounts. Most of the expenditure was in one sense controllable, except as to one or two particular branches. The expenditure upon public institutions, upon education, upon colonization roads, upon public works and buildings, and upon railway aid was controllable in the sense that it might have been cut off almost entirely by the Government, and so much money would have been saved if the only object of the Government had been to see how large a sum they could accumulate in the public chest. So also they might have enforced the payment by defaulting municipalities of Municipal Loan Fund indebtedness, and treated in like manner almost every item of expenditure, with the sole exception of Civil Government and Legislation. The expenditure upon these items must be made if the public affairs of the Province were to be carried on at all. Yet the hon. the leader of the Opposition held up the bugaboo of direct taxation as a result if the course he had spoken of were not followed, and a policy of reduction, such as he had mentioned, inaugurated. If such a wholesale reduction of the expenditure were decided upon, one of the items which would have to be greatly reduced was that for Public Institutions. Was there one of those institutions which was useless and could be done without?

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER—The Model Farm.

Mr. FRASER said that last session the Opposition were driven to bay and had to admit that the farmers of the country were entitled to a share of the expenditure of the public money. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BELL—The School of Technology.

Mr. FRASER said that the School of Technology was started by the very wise Government of Sandfield Macdonald, and he did not think the mechanics of the country would thank the member for West Toronto for his opposition to that institution. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BELL asked if the School were now conducted on the same principles as those upon which it had been started.

Mr. FRASER said that it was, and that besides it had been made much more useful by an increased expenditure upon it.

Mr. BELL asked how many mechanics were now attending that institution.

Mr. FRASER could not tell offhandly what the number was, but if his hon. friend would put a motion upon the paper, or refer to the reports, he would get the information he desired. It was somewhat strange that the member for West Toronto, in whose constituency the School of Technology was, should not take interest enough in that institution to induce him to visit it, and obtain the information himself. If the policy of which he had been speaking a moment ago were put into operation—that of shutting off entirely controllable expenditure—worse results than direct taxation would follow. All the public institutions in the Province would have to be closed, and the inmates now there would have to be sent back to be a burden and a blight upon the people of the country. The maintenance of these institutions by the Government prevented such results, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite refused, as a fair and honourable Opposition should, to give them credit for the expenditure in that direction. The expenditure upon colonization roads was demanded by the people of the back country, and was an entirely necessary expenditure. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite refused to give them credit for the increased expenditure under that head. The increase under the head of administration of justice had been mainly caused by the Government relieving the people of charges that would otherwise be borne directly by them, and yet the Opposition refused to take the circumstances connected with that increase into account. He would institute a comparison