

Comparison between the cost of civil government in 1871 and 1884, the hon. member for North Grey should either have added these or he should not have made the comparison at all. Another item which his hon. friend had failed to prove was extravagant was that of \$8,333 for the Board of Health. The best way to make a comparison of the cost of civil government in our own Province was to compare it with that of other Provinces or with the Dominion. Civil Government in Ontario last year cost 9½ *per capita*, while down in the good Tory Province of Quebec it cost 12½, and in the Dominion 21½. Next referring to the comparison of the

COST OF LEGISLATION

between 1871 and 1884, showing an increase of \$66,769, he stated that one of the largest items was the indemnity to members, which had increased by \$15,772 last year. That was a matter over which gentlemen opposite had had as much control as the Government. But the largest item of all was that for stationery and printing of sessional papers. Here again he would compare the cost to this Province with that of the Dominion and other Provinces. The *per capita* cost in British Columbia was 24½; Manitoba, 24; Dominion, 13½; Quebec, 13; New Brunswick, 9½; Nova Scotia, 8½; Ontario, 7½. In regard to our public institutions he did not know a better way of testing the expenditure than to compare them with similar institutions elsewhere. The average cost of all our asylums had been \$133 per head for 1884, while in a long list which he had prepared of similar institutions outside of Ontario, it was \$180 50. Next taking up the question of the claim which this Province had upon the Dominion for the Provincial railways which the Federal Government had assumed control of, he maintained that in accordance with the principle of equity upon which this Confederation was based it was impossible to allow the Dominion authorities to grant money to Quebec for its Provincial railways and to refuse to do so to Ontario or here. He waited to see what side hon. gentlemen opposite would take upon this question. He did not know whether they would stand up for the rights of their Province or not. (Opposition laughter.) He could tell all about it if he only knew what Sir John Macdonald told them to do about it. They joined him in all his hostility to this Province, but in regard to all our Provincial rights the Government have been successful, and he believed they would ultimately triumph on this question.

Mr. CARNEGIE contended that notwithstanding the additional grant of \$140,000 from the Dominion, one-half of which we got last year, there had been a deficit. The Treasurer also had borrowed a quarter of a million of dollars, and he had now no other resource from direct taxation but knocking at the door of the Dominion. He proceeded to assert that the railway liabilities of two and a half millions should be added to the liabilities of the Province. Under the management of the present Government, he contended that it now became a question whether they had not withdrawn all the Crown Lands officials and given it up as an asset, so little was the net revenue derived from it.

Hon. A. M. ROSS—Is that the policy of the Opposition?

Mr. CREIGHTON—Giving it back to the people.

Mr. AWREY—Like they do at Ottawa.

Mr. CARNEGIE, proceeding, submitted that the question of the liability of the Province for the Indian claims should be submitted for legal settlement before the details of the accounts were settled. The comparison of the Treasurer, he contended, had been unfair because he had taken the cost of maintenance, and had omitted the items respecting the building of them. Who built the lunatic asylum at London, the institutions at Belleville and Brantford, and other places but the Sandfield Macdonald Government? Taking the amount of money received by this Government, that by the Sandfield Macdonald Government, and the receipts of the two Governments, this Government could not account for over seven millions of dollars of the people's money. He contended that last year's administration of this had afforded the spectacle of the largest over-expenditure ever seen in this or any Province. The Province, he said, was approaching the time when the surplus would be gone and direct taxation staring us in the face. The over-expenditures last year were really \$261,000. He recollected in 1871 when only \$20,000 was taken for unforeseen and unprovided for, and this had been exceeded. Mr. Blake had put on record a motion in the Public Accounts Committee condemning the over-expenditure. In the matter of inspection of insurance companies, the under-expenditure was stated to be \$2,518, when in point of fact, with the \$3,000 received from insurance companies, there was an actual deficit of \$481. Referring to the over-expenditure, he said \$29,964 related to legislation, and of this \$8,220 goes to sessional writers. The repairs and maintenance of the centre part of the buildings cost \$15,680, an over-expenditure of over ten thousand dollars, \$3,975 for furniture and finishings, \$1,584 for carpets, and for the addition to the House \$2,000, on account of the contract which was not included in the vote taken last session.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—The item certainly was voted either in the estimates or the supplementary estimates.

Mr. CARNEGIE—The over-expenditure on criminal justice was \$8,075, and he proceeded to criticize the items. The over-expenditure in the Education Department had not been referred to by the hon. gentleman, although the "miscellaneous" was over-expended to the extent of \$9,657, and of this \$9,518 was for the publication account, almost exactly the amount of the over-expenditure. This, he thought, was for the publication of the "Readers," and of this possibly \$7,500 would be returned by the publishers. He congratulated the Commissioner of Public Works upon the fact that there had been an under-expenditure, and he plumed himself that some of the under-expenditure had resulted from his protests. Reviewing the payments to inspectors of colonization roads he asserted that nearly seven thousand dollars had been paid to men who were actually political agents.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Hada't you better make a charge to that effect?

Mr. CARNEGIE said he was quoting from what transpired in the Public Accounts Committee. He contended that the proposal to apply for an increased grant from the Dominion on account of population was not in the interests of the Dominion.

Hon. A. M. ROSS—And let the other Provinces get it?

Mr. CARNEGIE—Let the other Provinces make it first, and even if it is made, it should not be made on the question of population. If other Provinces applied, then there were Ontario's representatives in the Dominion House who would look after the interests of Ontario. He contended that the increase of 1884 had been given according to the basis of population of 1881.

Hon. A. M. ROSS—No, no.

Mr. CARNEGIE—Yes, I think you are mistaken there.

Hon. A. M. ROSS—No, the subsidy was granted to Ontario and Quebec on the same basis as that of 1873, and this was on the ratio of debt as at the time of Confederation with regard to the four old Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and on the basis of population for the three new Provinces of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, and Manitoba.

Mr. CARNEGIE—If the grant by the Act of 1884 to Ontario and Quebec were divided according to the population of Ontario in 1881, should it not amount to a large sum for Ontario?

Hon. A. M. ROSS—Most assuredly.

Mr. CARNEGIE proceeded to argue that it would be unfair to this Province to ask for a re-adjustment of the subsidy according to population because it was granted by the Government supporters that Ontario paid a larger proportion per head of the Customs and Excise duties. After arguing that the administration of the Crown Lands Department had been defective, because it had only resulted in a net revenue of \$170,000, he moved the adjournment of the debate.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock.