

TO AMEND THE REGISTRY ACT.

Hon. C. F. FRASER explained that the Act provided for a mistake in the old Act, which was not clear as to the place where plans of towns or villages should be filed.

The Bill was read the second time.

THE RAINY RIVER ACT.

Hon. O. MOWAT said the Bill is one to give to the inhabitants of the western portion of the Province, now decided by the Privy Council to belong to Ontario, the benefit of local institutions, and the Administration of Justice Act. For the purpose of the Act the territory west of the old provisional line agreed on for certain purposes with the Dominion Government is taken, and the provisions of the Bill relating to the Thunder Bay district, while a territorial district, were taken. The Bill provides for a registry office for deeds, a surrogate court, and registry office for a larger jurisdiction for the courts than exists there at present. These changes are desirable and necessary there, as the district would have had them if the territory had been adjudged to belong to Manitoba. When we set off the district from Thunder Bay we were anxious to find a natural boundary between the district of Thunder Bay and Rainy River, but this, on consultation with parties from the district, was found to be impossible, and no better line could be found than the provisional line agreed upon about ten years ago. The provisions of the Act of last session, agreeing for a reference to the Privy Council, expired on the judgment being made, but in consequence of the delay in information reaching there it is necessary that a date be named so that the acts of the Council may be legalized, as they continued to exercise their functions after the date of the judgment was actually delivered.

Mr. MEREDITH—When did the provisional council cease to act?

Hon. O. MOWAT—On the 24th October.

Mr. MEREDITH—What is now done?

Hon. O. MOWAT—The provisions of the Bill say that the old Council should revive, so that the old Board really revived when the Order in Council was made.

Mr. MEREDITH—In point of fact, did the old Council resume its duties?

Hon. O. MOWAT—Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH—On the 24th October?

Hon. O. MOWAT—Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH—What officers will be required under the Act?

Hon. O. MOWAT—A registrar of deeds, a surrogate court clerk, who will also be deputy-clerk for the purpose of issuing writs. I have not provided for a sheriff, but it on further consideration I had it is needful, I shall ask the House to do so.

Mr. MEREDITH—Is there any definite information as to the population other than the floating population in this district?

Hon. O. MOWAT—Of course there is no certain information.

Mr. MEREDITH—There are no polling places for long distances?

Hon. O. MOWAT—For long distances the country is very sparsely populated.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—The army of occupation is gone. (Laughter.)

The Bill was read the second time.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN was warmly applauded on rising to resume the debate on the Budget. It was not, he said, his intention to detain the House at any great length, for two reasons—first, because the Treasurer in making his statement made it with the same fulness and ability which characterized his address last year; and secondly, because his hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Creighton) in replying made an attack upon the finances of the Province which was very mild and required few remarks. In the first place he regretted that the questions between the Provinces—and the Province of Ontario particularly—had not been settled. Well, they regretted that, but he would like the House to remember where the fault lay. The Provincial Treasurer of Ontario went down to Ottawa last year, where he was met by the Treasurer of Quebec and Sir Leonard Tilley, to make an effort to settle these matters, but they were balked in the first step of their progress by Sir Leonard Tilley saying that he could not go on without the presence of Sir John Macdonald, that if progress had not been made, let the fault be placed at the door of those who were to blame. Then his hon. friend had made a great outcry because the estimate had been very much exceeded by the expenditure. He was willing to admit that it was well for the Government to make estimates which would more than cover their expenditure, but there were times when it was not possible to do this. If it was wrong for the Government of this Province to exceed their estimates in their expenditure, it was surely wrong for others to do the same thing. He asked the attention of the House to the management by the Dominion Government of their financial affairs during the last year. The

DOMINION GOVERNMENT

asked in their estimates last year for legislation, \$648,900; they have expended \$662,767, or their expenditure exceeded their estimates by \$13,867. For Geological Survey they asked \$60,000, and expended \$115,929, or their expenditure exceeded their estimate by \$55,929. For the Militia Department they asked \$779,600 and expended

\$980,498, or exceeded their estimate by \$209,898. For Public Works they asked \$2,447,940 and expended \$2,938,851, an excess over their estimate of \$490,911.

Mr. MEREDITH—Does that list include the supplementary estimates?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—I think so. At all events I will give the total excess, including supplementary estimates. For Miscellaneous they asked \$194,950 and spent \$336,670, an excess of \$141,720; for Indian Grants they asked \$875,949 and expended \$1,116,158, and exceeded their estimate by \$240,209; for the Mounted Police they exceeded their estimate by \$69,983; in the Customs Department the excess was \$69,983; in the Excise \$15,137, and in the Postoffice \$74,655; or taking the whole estimates—supplementary and all—the Government asked for \$29,951,989, and they expended \$31,107,706 and their expenditure over their estimates was \$1,145,717. (Hear, hear.) He was not quoting these figures to justify an excess of the expenditures over the estimates by the Provincial Government,

but in order to show that if there was an excess of expenditure it was wrong there as well as here, and that it could not be right there and wrong here. But while he thought it was well, if possible, to keep the estimates within the expenditure, he did not regard the great question as being whether they have been exceeded, but whether one dollar has been expended by this Government during the past year which was not necessary. In looking over these excessive expenditures he found that the cost of the administration of justice in 1871 was \$182,621, while in 1884 it was \$331,027, an increase of \$148,406. In regard to this item it was very difficult to determine what the expenditure would be. He took this ground, that the expense depended very largely on the times. If the times were good there was less crime than if they were bad, because people had less opportunity to get into mischief. He thought a comparison of the cost of the administration of justice in different years would establish this point. In 1877, when we were entering on a period of depression, we found that the expenditure was \$277,302. One year later, in 1878, which was perhaps the worst period of that commercial crisis, we found that it had gone up to \$285,369. But in 1879 the depression began to pass away, and we found the expenditure then \$274,013—much less than in the previous year. In 1880 the times were much better, and we found the expenditure \$263,070. In 1881 it went down to \$251,119; in 1882 there was a slight increase to \$262,731, and again in 1883 to \$275,214; and last year, which was the worst we had had for a long time, we found the expenditure had gone up again to \$331,026. He wished the House to remember that though the estimates had been exceeded by the expenditure, that excess had mainly gone to the municipalities of this Province, \$8,000 out of the \$11,785 excess which had been collected from them being returned. The next item to which he called attention was that relating to

CROWN LANDS

and colonization roads. We found an over expenditure in Crown Lands of \$36,000, and in colonization roads of \$26,626. They all knew that there had been a boom in the North-West for some years past, but that last year that boom was passing away, and immigrants instead of going there settled down on the good agricultural soil of Ontario, and the Government had to push the survey of new townships. In this one item alone there had been a great increase in the expenditure over what was expected—\$21,000—but there was no one who would blame the Government for this expenditure. We all knew that this increased settlement meant increased colonization roads, and therefore we found an increase in that item, but not so much as would appear. The increase over the estimates would appear to be \$26,000, but he believed one-half of that was paid on roads previously built.

Mr. MEREDITH—In 1883?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—Yes, in 1883. He wished to refer to another matter to which he had referred to before. Hon. friends opposite were in the habit of stating that there was always an increase in colonization roads during any year in which a parliamentary election occurred, either for the Dominion House or this one. He had taken the trouble to make up a statement of the expenditures for seven years in which elections were held, and for six years in which no elections were held, and he asked the attention of the House to these figures. The expenditures during the election years were as follows:—1872, \$75,799,419; 1874, \$90,762,43; 1875, \$103,511,89; 1878, \$85,612,48; 1879, \$114,564,13; 1882, \$110,650; 1883, \$123,497,47; or a total of \$704,397,59, and an average yearly expenditure of \$100,728,22. Taking the next item, years in which there were no elections, they found the following expenditures:—In 1873, \$145,950; 1876, \$85,931,43; 1877, \$77,300; 1880, \$96,539,99; 1881, \$97,289,80; 1884, \$185,772,55— or an average of \$114,847,29, which was a greater average than during the years when elections were held. (Hear, hear, and applause.) In regard to this over-expenditure, it was perfectly justifiable, and more than this, if the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition had had control, according to the stories he was telling up North last year, it would have been \$200,000 instead of \$155,050, so that certainly he had no right to complain if the estimates had been exceeded in

that respect. In EDUCATION

there appeared to be an over-expenditure of \$10,000. There were some matters in connection with the Education Department which made it difficult to estimate what the expenditure would be. It would be utterly impossible for the Provincial Treasurer to determine an increased demand upon the superannuation fund of \$3,000. What Minister could see what increase would be required for Departmental examinations this year? But although the estimate had been exceeded, at the same time the income from the Department had been very much increased also, so that the one would balance the other. Then there had been an increase in the demand for charity and hospitals, and the remark would apply here again which he had made about people out of employment there would be far more demands in this direction than at another time. Then there were other items which had gone to a considerable extent towards swelling the amount expended over and above the estimates. We found that a note was taken for \$10,000, in connection with the disputed territory, but it had cost very much more than that estimate.

Mr. MEREDITH—That was not last year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—It was going on last year.

Mr. MEREDITH—This was expended in law suits.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—That was necessary in defending ourselves in that territory. Here was another little item. Hon. gentlemen would remember that last session a little egg was being hatched out in their interest by a brawling brood of bribers, and that had cost the country \$8,117. He would not detain the House longer in referring to these items, but he would say that before hon. gentlemen could prove that the Government were extravagant, they must take up these items individually, and point out some of them that were unnecessary and uncalled for in the efficient management of the country. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Creighton) had claimed that if this Government had gone on with the expenditure in the same ratio as the John Sandfield Macdonald Government they would have saved to this Province in the last ten years \$6,850,000.

Mr. CREIGHTON—No. I was giving them credit for what they had done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—The sum of his argument was that the Government would have been \$6,850,000 richer and the people that much poorer. The policy of this Government was

NOT TO HOARD

up its money; it was to pay out every dollar it possibly could. Then his hon. friend said there had been paid out during the last year \$20,669 to our Public, High, and poor schools, and to the superannuated teachers, and that the rest of the appropriation had been taken to run the Department, but he did not venture to point out one single dollar devoted to an object which should be done away with. He made a statement and sent it to the country and deceived the people without giving them the full facts of the case. With regard to our inspectors he (Mr. McLaughlin) would say that if the amount of money they paid out annually was wrong, it was the heritage given to the Government by the late Superintendent of Education, and if the system were wrong let the blame rest on one whom gentlemen opposite were always ready to adore. He claimed that every Public and every High School Inspector was as much a teacher as any teacher in any school section in the Province. Our inspectors were the teachers of the teachers. They were not appointees of the Government, but men of superior talent and ability who were the pick of the municipalities, and they were certainly doing a good work. With regard to the Normal Schools, if the Leader of the Opposition were to step across the floor and remain true to his past history, instead of having two Normal Schools in the Province we would only have one at London, for that was the effect of one of his motions some years ago. Every hon. gentleman must conclude that these schools were as much in the interest of the people as anything possibly could be. We must determine if teachers were qualified to teach, and to determine that we must have examinations, and we could not have them without paying for it. So he thought all the expenditures which the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Creighton) had sought to prove were unnecessary, were really in the public interest. Next taking up the

COMPARISON OF THE COST

of civil government and legislation between the years 1871 and 1884, he said it was time that it had increased, but not beyond the volume of work done then in comparison with that done now. In 1871 there were 43 sessional clerks, while in 1884 there were 96, which was more than twice as many as in 1871 and his hon. friend from London (Mr. Meredith) and his friends were responsible for this increase by reason of their many motions for returns. Then it would be remembered that in 1873 there was an increase made in the salaries of civil servants, in which the hon. member for London concurred. In connection with civil government, in 1871 we had two inspectors of prisons and asylums, but now there was added to these an inspector of registry offices and an inspector of insurance companies. In making