

Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen say, "but you have

EXPENDED MORE MONEY

than the Sandfield Macdonald Government did." Sir, I admit we have expended more money than they did. I am glad of it, I am proud of it, because it has brought more than fourfold advantages to the people of this country. It would not, and should not, avail this Government very much if I were able to say, "We have a surplus of fifteen or twenty million dollars in the treasury," and leave it open to some hon. member opposite to rise and say, "Yes, you have that large surplus, but it is at the expense of the development of this country." Sir, John Sandfield Macdonald did not build any railways; we have built some 2,000 miles, and expended millions of money upon them. John Sandfield Macdonald did not distribute money among the people, but we have distributed millions among the people to relieve their burdens, and enable them to make their improvements. John Sandfield Macdonald built some 213 miles of colonization roads; we have built no less than 2,695 miles of colonization roads. (Cheers.) It would take too long to enumerate what this Government have done over what the Sandfield Macdonald Government did. We have acted upon the principle that it is not the highest aim of a Government to hoard up money, but to ascertain what the requirements and wants of the people are and to supply them as far as possible. I have been in this House a great many years, and I am bound to say that I never listened to a speech more abundant in incorrect statements than the one I have just listened to by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Currie). (Applause.) I repeat the statement. During the eighteen years which I have sat in this House I have never listened to a speech more abundant in reckless assertions—statements both incorrect and untrue—than the one I have just listened to. Now, Sir, as a sample of the speech which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman, he starts out with the statement that this Government have not accounted for seven millions of the people's money. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Creighton) said that the Government could not account for two and a half millions. I wish that hon. gentlemen opposite would agree upon the amount. Why, Sir, the hon. member for West Peterborough goes him three times better. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. MEREDITH—Explain that to the Attorney-General.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—I have no doubt that there is no one in the House who understands what that means better than the hon. member for London. (Laughter.) He knows all about it, Sir. The hon. member for West Peterborough tries to give emphasis to the statement that there are seven millions unaccounted for by saying that we are bound to account for all our moneys, thus leaving the impression to go abroad that we have

STOLEN OR EMBEZZLED

seven millions of dollars, for that is what his statement amounts to. Now, Sir, no hon. gentleman knows better than he does that every single dollar has been accounted for, because every single dollar that is spent goes into the public accounts, where everybody can see what we expended it for. No one knows better than he does that the excess of expenditure over the Sandfield Macdonald Government was what was required by the Province; that it was largely increased on account of education, public institutions, increased grants to charities and hospitals, and in various other ways, and yet the hon. gentleman stands up and says there are several millions of money which are not accounted for. Now, Sir, I appeal to this House to consider whether that statement is correct. It is a harmless one in the House, because hon. members do not receive it, but, Sir, the hon. gentleman has been relegated to the front benches by his leader, and should not be reckless in his statements, and I say that statement is entirely incorrect and entirely untrue. (Hear, hear.) I believe that is Parliamentary. I do not say he had intentionally made an untrue statement, because perhaps he does not know it is untrue, but what I say is that the statement is untrue. And one who has sat so long in this House had no right to make it, and he was attempting to mislead the country and his fellow members when he did so. Is that the way he speaks out in the country? If it is I do not wonder that he and his friends remain in opposition because extravagant statements always bring their own punishment, and hon. gentlemen must make statements somewhere near what the facts are. Well, Sir, let me follow up the hon. gentleman. He does not do things by half at all. He goes the whole hog. (Great laughter.) The hon. gentleman who sits at his right hand, says:—We have to account for two millions and a half but the hon. member for West Peterborough saw that this did not create much sensation, so he says we must be out seven millions. The member for North Hastings (Mr. Wood) could not believe it; he looked aghast. (Laughter.) But this hon. gentleman who takes such an exaggerated view of the amount of money mislaid by this Government is going to do away entirely with the Crown Lands office. He takes a summary way of crushing out one member of the Government by wiping out the Crown Lands Department altogether. Why? Because he says the receipts are so small and the expenditure of running it so great that it is hardly worth while running it at all and it might as well be closed. The hon. gentleman bows his assent, and

I am glad to get it, because I intend to disclose the hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.) I say, Sir, that a man who would make that statement in the year 1885, after the Crown Lands Department has been in existence as long as it has been, and after the work which it is and has been doing, in ignorance, ought to think seriously as to

WHETHER HE SHOULD NOT RETIRE

from Parliament altogether,—(laughter)—and the man who makes it willfully stands precisely in the same position. (Hear, hear.) How did the hon. gentleman, in order to satisfy his conscience, make up this statement? Instead of taking the receipts from the Crown Lands Department from 1872 to 1884, during which time the present Government has been in power, he says nothing about these, but confines himself to last year, 1884, when the receipts from the Department had fallen off a good deal, when there was great depression in the country, and in the timber trade especially, when revenues all over the world had decreased and when those of the Dominion had fallen off some millions of dollars. He takes the receipts for 1884, some \$575,000 in round numbers, and from this amount he deducts the cost of the Crown Lands office, the cost of surveys, the cost of colonization roads, the expense of the Forest Ranger (who is not in my Department, but in that of the Commissioner of Agriculture), and the cost of certain works done under my friend the Commissioner of Public Works, and then he says, "Look at the small excess of receipts over expenditure." Even according to his own statement this excess was \$170,000, but his statement is all wrong. Why should the cost of surveys be charged against the management of the Crown Lands Department? Would the Government not have to make surveys whether there was a Crown Lands Department or not? (Hear, hear.) Take colonization roads in the same way; why should they be charged to the management of the Crown Lands Department? Would it not be the duty of the Government to construct colonization roads for the purpose of settling up our new districts whether we had a Crown Lands revenue or not, as long as we could afford it? (Hear, hear.) Again, why should the work done under the Public Works Department in opening up certain streams be made a charge upon the revenue of the Crown Lands Department?

IT WOULD BE JUST AS FAIR

to charge the cost of public buildings to the management of the Public Works Department as to charge my Department with the cost of constructing colonization roads, and making surveys. But, Sir, I will refer the hon. gentleman to the Dominion. What is the practice of the Dominion Government in regard to surveys? If the hon. gentleman will go into the library and look up the public accounts of the Dominion for last year, he will find that the cost of surveys in the North-West is charged to capital account. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MEREDITH—But your party objects to it.

Mr. PARDEE—I will undertake to say that my hon. friend will side with the Dominion in this matter, even against the hon. member for West Peterborough, for it will never do for him to take any other course. (Laughter.) What are the facts? Between the years 1872 and 1884 we have received from the Crown Lands Department the sum of \$10,000,000, and I want to show how entirely incorrect the hon. gentleman is, even following his own mode of calculation. The figures I have here will show how much foundation there is for his statement that the Crown Lands Department might as well be closed up. For the thirteen years, the total cost of management and collection in Crown Lands Department was \$1,100,000, the total expenditure upon colonization roads \$1,392,595, the total cost of surveys \$502,011, and for repairs—for I want to include every possible item of expense—the cost was \$190,192. Did this expenditure exhaust all the revenue from the Department during these thirteen years? Instead of doing so, it left a net revenue, even adopting the hon. gentleman's unfair method, of \$6,754,249. (Applause.) And yet this new financier says the Crown Lands Department might as well be closed altogether. (Laughter.) Another statement made by the hon. member for West Peterborough in connection with this matter was that every \$100 collected in the Crown Lands Department cost \$64 to collect it. When I heard the hon. gentleman make this statement I was startled; I fancied he had

GO "MIXED AND MUDDLED"

in his figures. (Laughter.) Let us look at the facts. For the 13 years which I have been taking, it cost to collect \$100 including everything except colonization roads and surveys, which I believe every hon. member will say ought to be charged to capital account, instead of \$64, only \$11. Taking the total cost of collection during that period, \$1,100,000, from the gross revenue, \$10,000,000, we have a clear profit in the 13 years of \$8,900,000 from the Crown Lands Department. (Cheers.) I ask the leader of the Opposition if he agrees with the proposal to close up the Crown Lands Department. There would be a necessity for such a Department, even if there were no surveys to make or colonization roads to construct, in order to promote the settlement of the new districts of the Province. The policy of the present Government in connection with these new districts has been largely

a free grant policy, and it must not be forgotten that it costs just as much to give away land as it does to sell it. Our receipts from the sale of lands have not been so large proportionately as they were in Sandfield Macdonald's time, this being a consequence of our free grant policy. Such lands as we have sold have been mostly at 20 or 50 cents an acre, which has had the tendency of making the percentage of the cost of collection appear larger than under the Sandfield Macdonald Government. I am not sure that it is larger, but even if it is, the reason I have given more than accounts for the increase. Let me apply the new logic and the new reasoning of the member for West Peterborough to the land transactions of the Dominion, logic and reasoning with which, I venture to say, Sir Leonard Tilley would not agree. In the Dominion last year the receipts from lands were \$951,636. The expenditure on account of lands, chargeable to capital account, was \$728,441, and chargeable to income, \$166,898, making a total expenditure on account of lands of \$895,339, which would leave to the Dominion a net revenue of \$56,297, according to the reasoning of my hon. friend. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) My hon. friend says that we have not taken into account the

REVENUES FROM THE NEW TERRITORY.

Well, Sir, that statement comes with bad grace from my hon. friend, when we consider that hon. gentlemen upon that side of the House have been largely, and I don't know that they have not been entirely to blame for our being deprived of the revenues from that part of the Province, and the course taken by their leader at Ottawa in illegally keeping us out of possession of that country, and revenues from it, has been applauded and supported by the Opposition here. (Applause.) The crucial test of the hon. gentlemen's sincerity has yet to be applied, and it is to be seen whether the hon. gentlemen will continue to oppose the Province's interest. Now, it is very little use to have the boundaries of the Province settled if the Dominion Government is to seize and keep possession of the land and timber, and one is curious to know what course hon. gentlemen opposite will take when the matter is submitted to them. Will they stand by their Province? or will they repeat their former course and go over to the enemies of the Province? I hope for their own sake—I hope for the interests of the country—that they will stand by Ontario and resist the aggressive policy of the Dominion Government. (Applause.) They have hitherto deserted their Province and joined her boundary, upon the railway question, and upon that of the liquor licenses, they have deserted their Province. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition moved a resolution and made a speech, and I have searched the resolution through, and read the speech, but I failed to find one single sentence which could be construed as a protest against the enemies of Ontario taking possession of her territories. Will hon. gentlemen stand by mutely and see Ontario despoiled, or will they protest against the Dominion Government's course in this respect? Let me come to the

QUESTION OF EXPENDITURE

on Crown lands and colonization roads, and I think it necessary for me to make an explanation as to the manner in which the expenditure of the Crown Lands Department stands in the Public Accounts. The hon. member for West Peterborough said that there was a great discrepancy between the expenditure of 1883 and 1884 in the Crown Lands Department. Now, Sir, according to the Public Accounts, there is a discrepancy between these years, and let me explain. In the Public Accounts for 1883 the expenditure on Crown Lands is put at \$67,131, while the amount for 1884 is put at \$103,000, an increase of \$35,000. There does, at first sight, appear to be a large difference here, but practically the expenditure of the Crown Lands Department in 1884 was the same as in 1883. It might have been a few thousand dollars more than in 1883, but practically it was the same. The next thing is to state how this arises. It arises from the fact that the Crown Lands Department has a special account in the bank and the Treasurer keeps the accounts in his office. In 1883 we took an estimate for \$81,000 under the head of Crown Lands expenditure.

Mr. MEREDITH—What is Crown Lands expenditure?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—Surveys, agents' salaries, and forest ranging.

Mr. MEREDITH—Colonization roads?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—No. I am speaking merely of the expenditure in the estimates under the head of Crown Lands.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Does that include surveys?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—Yes. We took for 1883, as I have said, an estimate of \$81,000 while we really expended \$80,886, but the Treasury Department closed its accounts when \$61,137 had been paid, leaving apparently \$13,749 unexpended, when, as a matter of fact, it was all expended. But if you will take the report of the Commission of Crown Lands and compare it with the Public Accounts for several years, you will find that it dovetails exactly, and that there is no discrepancy. (Hear, hear.) For 1884 there was voted by this House \$83,400 for the service of the year, and then we took a re-vote for the amount of the apparently unexpended