

pending balance of \$13,749, showing a total vote for 1884 of \$97,148, whereas we only really took for the service in 1884 \$83,400, and the amount actually expended was \$89,257, being an over-expenditure of \$5,857.

Mr. MEREDITH—Is that shown by the Public Accounts?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—It is shown by the Crown Lands report. The Crown Lands Department pays its expenditures out of its special account, and at the end of every month takes out an accountable warrant from the Treasurer for the amount.

Mr. MEREDITH—Is not that a bad system?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—It may be, but it is one which is difficult to avoid. For you have to do with men who are in many cases in districts removed from all facilities for conducting business by the usual methods; they are distant from banks, and we have to send money to them in bills, and I contend that though the system is not one we would willingly have chosen, it is one which it seems impossible to avoid. I would be glad to avoid it, and so I have tried to get out of it. The hon. gentleman in making the statement that the expenditure of 1884 is larger than that of 1883 knows very well how the matter stands, for he has had the system explained to him in the Public Accounts Committee, and yet he contends here that there has been a large increase when there has been no increase at all. He also claims that there has been a large increase in surveys. Now I want to explain to the House and the country that there has been no increase for 1884 over the amount for 1883. In 1883 the amount voted for surveys as per estimates was \$40,600; the Public Accounts for 1883 show an expenditure of only \$29,591, whereas the whole amount was expended. In 1884 a re-vote was taken for the balance, and the amount of the re-vote and the expenditure for that year appear in the Public Accounts for 1884, making the apparent expenditure \$50,098. He complains of over-expenditure in 1884, and yet I say there was no over-expenditure, as will readily be seen from my statement. (Applause.) The hon. gentleman complains of some over-expenditure for sessional writers, and endeavours to show that we have been extravagant as compared with Sandfield Macdonald's Government. Well, as has been pointed out, the hon. gentleman is himself as much responsible for this as any member of the House on account of the number of returns he moves for and which are ordered to be brought down. These necessitate the employment of extra sessional writers, and for this he must assume the accountability. Let me refer to the Dominion Government.

Mr. MEREDITH—Is that the true standard?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—Hon. gentlemen always point to the Dominion Government when it is to their interest to do so, but whenever it is against them they ignore it. They are in favour of going back to the Sandfield Macdonald Government of 18 years ago, and object to a comparison with the Dominion Government of 1884. In his report on last year's Public Accounts the Dominion Auditor-General calls attention to the extra clerks employed, and shows that in the Interior Department the sum paid for them was \$54,992, in the Department of Public Works \$53,051, Railways and Canals \$34,937, Agriculture and Census \$32,801, and Geological Survey \$13,280. The total sum amounts to about two hundred thousand dollars expended for extra clerks, and yet with this large sum before them hon. gentlemen oppose and complain of the slight increase of expenditure of this Government over that of Sandfield Macdonald. They do not refer to this because they are ashamed to, and I must confess that I was astonished when I saw the immense sums, and as I looked into the Public Accounts I almost doubted my own eyes. Now the hon. gentleman comes to the subject of

#### COLONIZATION ROADS,

and I will deal with it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carnegie) revels in colonization roads; this is the one subject on which the hon. gentleman delights to dwell. It appears to be the only part of the financial statement to which he had very serious objections, and he has charged the Commissioner with all sorts of crimes, and stated that the servants of the Department are guilty of all kinds of corrupt acts. He has not said that every scoundrel is a colonization road overseer, but he wished us to believe that every colonization road overseer is a scoundrel. He implicated almost every one from the Commissioner down. He asserted that the money of the Department had been used for electioneering purposes, and as I had control of the money so I was responsible for it. The hon. gentleman asserted in tones of great indignation that the colonization road money had been used for electioneering purposes in Muskoka and Algoma. The hon. gentleman stands here in his place and makes cowardly attacks upon respectable men, almost every one of whom is as able as himself. I say it is a cowardly attack, because it is made in a place where the men cannot reply to him. He says these overseers have taken the colonization money and used it for electioneering purposes in Muskoka and Algoma. I would like to know what sort of agents the leader of the Opposition employs there? Who are they that are sent all over the country using the corrupt funds of the party? We all know Wilkinson and John Shields. These gentlemen are in the constant employ of hon. gentlemen opposite and using the weapons of

corruption against the friends of Ontario. They have used these men against us whenever opportunity offered, and they sent them first through Muskoka and Algoma. Though they were effectually employed in Muskoka, in Algoma they were not quite so successful. Again the leader of the Opposition took the chief of these two men to West Middlesex in order that he might exercise his wiles upon the honest electorate. He took him there in order that he might elect that poor man Johnston, who had just been unseated for bribery by the courts, and only escaped disqualification, as the judge remarked, by the skin of his teeth. The leader of the Opposition and this man Wilkinson were on the platform together, and what did they do? Mr. Wilkinson denounced the Commissioner of Crown Lands for making an expenditure upon Manitoulin Island, whence the Crown Lands Department did not derive any revenue, as the lands there were Indian lands.

Mr. MEREDITH—It was for the way in which the expenditure was made.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—I will just explain what it was. I have got The Free Press here. "He denounced the Crown Lands Department, for the Government had actually expended money upon Manitoulin Island, which is Indian land from which we derive no revenue." That is the statement he made, and yet when Mr. M. C. Cameron berated the Government for not expending money on Manitoulin Island because we were not getting revenue from it, the hon. leader of the Opposition stood by and had not a word of dissent. Then the case of these settlers was taken up; they were stated to be citizens of Ontario; that Manitoulin Island was part of the Province, and, therefore, they were entitled to the benefit of the expenditures from the Provincial exchequer. My hon. friend did not then demur to that, and yet he allows this man, Wilkinson, to denounce the Government because we had expended money upon that very island. It is upon such a basis as this that charges of corruption are made against the Department. My hon. friend cites particular cases where two or three members of a family are employed upon a road, and gives this as the reason why he charges that the colonization road funds have been improperly administered. I am not aware that any more money went to the persons than they were properly entitled to, or that the Province got any fewer miles of road in consequence of their being employed. Then again, he says that we have over-expended, and this I admit, but it is not true or correct that we expended \$185,000 in 1884 as shown in the Public Accounts for that year, and this the hon. member for West Peterborough knew pretty well. The over-expenditure for 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 amounted to \$36,596, and these over-expenditures the Government had charged up and put in the Public Accounts for 1884. Suppose the over-expenditure in 1880 amounted to \$10,000, the very moment that our appropriation was exhausted the Treasurer closes his accounts for that year and the amount over-expended is carried forward to the next year, and is shown in the Public Accounts as having been expended in 1881; and so this goes on through the years until \$36,586 had accumulated in 1883. There is no deception in placing them in the Public Accounts for 1884, and if you will take the Public Accounts for a number of years and compare them with the report of the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the same years it will be found that they agree exactly. Therefore there is no wrong done, and no wrong intended. If hon. gentlemen were honest in their criticism they would attack the system and not attempt to show that \$185,000 had been spent in 1884. Let me point out exactly what was spent in 1884, because I have

#### NOTHING TO CONCEAL,

and I want this House and the country to fully understand my position in the matter. We proposed to take for 1884 \$122,550; we had over-expended up to then \$36,596 which had not been charged up to 1883, making \$159,000. Now, Sir, there was \$12,447 of the accounts of 1883 which had not been included in the \$36,596. This \$12,447 was paid in 1884, and there was over-expended in 1884 \$14,178, making in all \$185,772, though the total actually expended in 1884 was \$136,723. Then the hon. gentleman states that there had been an expenditure of \$7,000 upon three inspectors, when he must have known that the expenditure was not all for 1884.

Mr. CARNEGIE—I so stated.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—But what are the facts? He said that these three inspectors were paid \$7,000 among them, which amounts to \$7 a day for the whole year, when he must have known that this sum covered a greater period than the year, and that part of the expenditure was for 1883. As a matter of fact, the average pay for each inspector amounts to \$1,600 or \$1,700 a year, or they receive \$7 a day and pay their own expenses. Each one has to keep a horse, and one keeps two horses in order to enable him to do his work. In the large District of Muskoka and Parry Sound, Inspector Card keeps two horses, and I do not think that \$7 a day for men who have to pay their own expenses is extravagant remuneration. I shall not follow the hon. member into his dusters, his ice, and his vegetables, but will leave him among the cabbages. (Laughter.) If he will take a cartload of such little petty charges, and put them all together, they will not make up one of the scandals which the hon. gentlemen de-

fends in the Government at Ottawa; lumped all together they will not amount to one Onderdonk or Section B scandal. I desire to make a few statements in connection with the speech of the hon. member for North Grey. The House must have been struck with the great difficulty he had to find objections to the statement made by the Treasurer. He started off with the statement that the \$3,100,000 received from Crown Lands and timber by the Sandfield Macdonald Government had been treated as capital, and that, therefore, this Government ought to be condemned because they had not hoarded up the \$10,000,000 received by them from the same source. How does the hon. gentleman know that Sandfield Macdonald treated this sum as capital?

Mr. MEREDITH—The Treasurer said it was so treated.

Mr. PARDEE—I believe that if the Treasurer, who is dead and gone, could hear that statement made his bones would turn over and shake in the grave. Because the report of the Treasurer happened to show that the surplus in one year was \$3,100,000, the hon. gentleman concludes that the surplus comprises all the receipts from the Crown Lands Department. How does he know that that is not subsidy? I desire to refer to another statement somewhat more important. The hon. gentleman said there was only \$2,500,000 not accounted for, and was a good deal more easy upon us than the member for West Peterborough was. He says the \$2,500,000 can only be accounted for by the extra cost of civil government and legislation, and he let this statement go to the country, that the extra cost of civil government since Sandfield Macdonald's time had been \$2,500,000. Here is the future Minister, the embryo Treasurer, making such a statement. I will call attention to the statement that the extra cost of legislation and civil government had been \$2,500,000. The average amount expended by the Sandfield Macdonald government on civil government and legislation was \$174,233, and the average since has been \$279,619, and I have not deducted some services which were not in existence in Sandfield Macdonald's time—leaving a difference of \$105,377 against us. This multiplied by 13 will give us \$1,369,809, which will give the amount by us expended on civil government and legislation over the sum which would have been expended had the cost been continued at the same rate as thirteen years ago. This shows that the hon. gentleman was only \$1,132,000 wrong. (Applause.) He should not make such reckless statements as these calculated to mislead the House and the country. I don't deny that there has been an increase of expenditure. There must necessarily be an increase of expenditure, and I am only repeating a platform platitude when I say that there must be an increase of expenditure, with the increase of population. Let us compare the increase which has taken place in Ontario with the increase which has taken place in Quebec. This is a fair comparison and one which they are constantly making when serves their purpose. The increased cost of civil government in 1883 as compared with 1873 in Ontario, has been 10½ per cent., while in the same period the population has increased 18½ per cent. In Quebec the cost of civil government for 1882 was 32 per cent. over that of 1873, while the population had increased 12½ per cent. The cost of legislation in Ontario in 1883 increased over 1873 11½ per cent., population 18½ per cent.; while in Quebec the increased cost of legislation was 214 per cent. and the population, as I have said, only 12½ per cent. It may be said, however, that we don't take into consideration the fact that they have two Houses, but there are disadvantages against us sufficient to make up for that. Instead of finding fault with the increase, the true and manly course would have been to point out what increases are wrong instead of harping upon the fact that there has been an increase. Let them then make their charges in an open manner against our educational management, the maintenance of public institutions, or any other machinery of government, and we will meet them fairly and squarely. The hon. member for West Toronto has admitted that the mere fact of an increase of expenditure over the amount spent by Sandfield Macdonald was no evidence of extravagance, and I would recommend the hon. member for North Grey to take a lesson from him. Let me make a reference to another statement of the members for North Grey and West Peterborough. They say the Treasurer stated that unless the Dominion Government came to our help nothing stood between us and direct taxation. Now, the Treasurer said nothing of the kind. What the Treasurer did say was that the fixing of the subsidy for all time to come at the time of Confederation was a mistake, and that the present plan of giving special grants and subsidies to several Provinces was most unsatisfactory. Now I am sure that every gentleman who has given the subject any consideration will say that the present basis of Confederation is working most unsatisfactorily. Many Provinces have already received special aid and subsidies, either directly or indirectly, and as Ontario pays three-fifths of all the money that goes into the Dominion treasury, therefore three-fifths of these special subsidies and grants comes from Ontario. Ontario therefore in addition to paying the expenses of her own government has to bear an undue share of the

#### BURDENS OF THE OTHER PROVINCES.

This is most unsatisfactory, and I entirely agree with the Treasurer that if it continues Con-