

traffic had a tendency to increase the expenditure of the Province, and should be asked to bear the burden of those expenditures in order to repair the damage done. In 1874 a committee was appointed to inquire into the facts of the liquor traffic in the Province, and a series of questions were sent out to various parties—medical men, judges, magistrates, coroners, and others—in order that they might give information as to the harm done. In the first place he would speak of the harm done in regard to its effect on mental condition. The questions were sent to the superintendents of asylums, and he would take the lowest estimate of the harm done by the liquor traffic. Dr. Clarke, Superintendent of the Toronto Lunatic Asylum, said that at least ten per cent. of the insanity in this Province was produced directly or indirectly by the effects of intoxicating liquors. This was the lowest estimate, some of them being as high as 33 per cent. During the past year this Province had incurred an expenditure of \$379,956 to maintain the lunatics, and ten per cent. of this would be \$37,995. They were called upon to spend a very large amount of money for the maintenance of prisons, reformatories, and for the purposes of aiding charities. The question was sent to the judges, police and stipendiary magistrates, and justices of the peace as to what proportion of the crimes tried under their jurisdiction could be traced to intemperance. There were hundreds of answers to that and as summarised by the committee were stated to be more than three-fourths. Superintendents of hospitals were questioned as to the number of patients brought into their institutions from the effects of the liquor traffic. The answer to this was the same and that three-fourths of the inmates came through drink. Coming to the Mercer Reformatory he thought all would acknowledge that three-fourths were there because of drink. He had come to the conclusion that taking all round they must come to the conclusion that three-fourths of the expenditure of the Province upon reformatories, hospitals, and prisons, were directly or indirectly traceable to drink, but in order that he might be perfectly free from exaggeration he would take it at two-thirds and he would give the figures of the out-go as affected by the liquor traffic.

Institution.	Expenditure.	60 p.c. on.
Central Prison.....	\$ 73,046	\$ 48,637
Reformatory for Boys..	40,021	26,680
Hospitals.....	81,600	53,737
Administration of Justice	275,244	183,496

The total of the amounts which represented the amount of expenditure directly traceable to the effects of drink. This justified his statement that the liquor traffic should provide a portion of the expenditure of the Province. It was unfair to compare the expenditure of the Province in 1871, when the Province was in its childhood, with that of 1883, when it was in its manhood. It would just be as unfair to compare the amount spent on clothing by the hon. member for North Grey when he was in swaddling clothes with that now. He contended that the Opposition could not claim to be the heirs of John Sandfield Macdonald or of his policy, and if he had done anything praiseworthy they could not claim the benefit of it. The member for North Grey had admitted that, with one single exception, the assets of the Province are genuine and stable items, and which could be put into cash; but in dealing with the Common School Fund he had shown himself to be, as the other side had always shown themselves to be, the advocates of the Dominion. But his hon. friend had complained that the Treasurer had asserted that in these matters of dispute between Ontario and the Dominion, the same dispute remained between the Province of Quebec and the Dominion, and also that the Treasurer had made the assertion that Quebec would join with Ontario in asserting and obtaining their just demand with regard to that matter. His hon. friend had stated Ontario was joining hands with Quebec, and the tune was changed. He explained that the difference between the Bleus of Quebec and the Bleus of this House was simply this: the Bleus of Quebec were loyal to their Province first and then to the Dominion; the Bleus of this House were loyal first to Sir John Macdonald and afterwards to the Province of Ontario. His hon. friend from North Grey had compiled a large number of tables to show that this Province was running behind financially. He had compiled all the deficits year by year and wiped out the surplus. In order that his hon. friend might compile his tables at all he had to adopt a false, unjustifiable, and an untenable attitude in regard to the receipts of the Province. The only ground upon which he could in any possible way bring about these deficits was by assuming that the amount of money received from Crown Lands was placed to capital account. He (Mr. McLaughlin) thought the finances of this Province should be discussed in the same simple, conscientious way that the members would discuss their own finances. They could assume a case. His hon. friend had said that the money obtained from the forests of this country should be considered as belonging to capital. A farmer sowed his grain and cut it, and from that grain he received a large amount of income. The same with the forest. Here was something cut from the soil, which was income. This was capital, according to the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. MEREDITH—Where will you get your second crop?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN explained that they would get their second crop in the minerals. (Hear,

hear.) He held that this income should be considered as an ordinary receipt. Overlooking this fact, and assuming a false doctrine as to treating the amount of revenue they derived from the woods and forests, the hon. gentleman opposite had been led into all his mistakes. If he (Mr. Creighton) had assumed control himself, would he give the Province the deficit which he had from year to year? His hon. friend, in a sort of clairvoyant mood, had made a table by which he discovered that the Ontario Government were not now receiving as much interest as they did in 1871. This was a startling table, according to his hon. friend. They found that the sum of money at interest under the John Sandfield Macdonald Government in 1871 brought the Province \$285,000, and in 1882 they only received \$76,000, therefore the finances of this Province were in a disastrous condition. This was the way in which the hon. gentlemen opposite looked at this subject. It had never been the policy of the Mowat Government to refuse to give the public all the money they possibly could, instead of hoarding up the large surplus. The Government contended that every dollar of money the Government could possibly spare was spent for the purpose of developing their railways, their drainage, and for the purpose of

#### AIDING AND DEVELOPING

the school system or the public institutions, instead of hoarding it up for the purpose of receiving interest upon it. The people of this country were convinced that this was the proper policy. The Government were doing a great deal to advance education in this Province. Not an hon. gentleman opposite would make a proposition against such a policy, because they knew that the people of the country would not tolerate it. The hon. gentleman opposite had told them that the expenditure for civil government cost so much in 1874, and that it cost so much more in 1883, or it had increased somewhere between 80 and 90 per cent. He had also stated that the expenditure for legislation had increased something like 70 per cent. He (Mr. McLaughlin) had adopted a plan of argument for 1871, and intended to prove that John Sandfield Macdonald's Government was far more extravagant than this Government. In 1871 there was expended in public buildings by the Sandfield Macdonald Government \$296,076. In 1883 there was expended \$129,839, or in other words the Sandfield Macdonald Government spent in '71 128 per cent. more than the present Government did in 1883. (Hear, hear.) In 1871 there was spent on public works \$134,543 as compared with \$41,062 in 1883, or the expenditure in 1871 was greater than the expenditure in 1883 by 227 per cent. The hon. gentleman opposite had compared 1871 with 1883, showing an increase without giving the House or the country one word of explanation. He intended to make this explanation. In that year the Sandfield Macdonald Government were building the Insane Asylum at London, and putting up public buildings here and there over the Province. He had no doubt but every dollar had been properly expended. He intended to refer to a few figures, and give more fully some of the reasons for the increase in the various departments in the Government. In 1883 the expenditure for civil government was \$202,898, and in 1871, \$111,413, an increase of \$91,485. This was in itself a proof that the volume of

#### BUSINESS HAD VASTLY INCREASED.

In 1871 there was but one Inspector of Prisons and now there was an Inspector of Prisons and an Inspector of Asylums. The whole license system and the costs of the management came under civil government expenditure since 1871. There was no Inspector of Registry Offices in 1871, neither was there an Inspector of Division Courts nor an Inspector of Insurance. These officials all showed an increase of business in every department. Then there was the increase in the salaries of the Ministers, and the salaries of the employees of the Government, to which the hon. gentlemen opposite offered no opposition. There was also the item of \$8,671 in connection with the Provincial Board of Health, and the large item added to the Education Department of \$17,103. He referred to the increased expenditure of the Dominion Government for civil government. He also showed that 253,650 volumes had been issued by the Ontario Government during 1883, for the purpose of keeping the people informed as to the steps taken by the Government. He gave the *per capita* cost of legislation for the different Provinces as follows:—British Columbia, 24 1-2 cents; Manitoba, 24; Dominion, 13 3-4; Quebec, 15 1-2; New Brunswick, 9 1-2; Nova Scotia, 8 1-2, and Ontario, 6 1-2 cents. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps the largest increase in expenditure was in connection with the public institutions. In 1871 the expenditure under the Sandfield Macdonald Government was \$171,423, and in 1883 it was \$648,995, or an increase of \$477,572. In 1871 there were only four institutions—the Toronto Asylum, the London Asylum, the Deaf and Dumb Institute, and the Reformatory—and now the following institutions were maintained:—The Blind Institute at Brantford, Mercer Reformatory for Women, Girls' Refuge, Orillia Asylum, Agricultural College, Central Prison, and the Ottawa Normal School, which had not been established in 1871. All these institutions increased the expenditure of the Province. The cost of maintenance at the Asylum in Toronto per head was \$131 per annum. In the asylums in Utica,