

WHAT KIND OF A CASE

the hon. gentleman has made out? Nay, I ask the supporters of the hon. gentleman what kind of a case he has made out. Has he given any instance of the money having been extravagantly expended? Has he given any case of the money having been improperly used? He has pointed out, it is true, that there are parties of the same name employed on the same work, and it seems to be the chief cause of complaint. I know that this is their chief stock argument when on the platform, but they cannot show that these people have not given full value for the money they have received. The hon. gentleman has shown that on five or six works there are several members of the O'Brien, Shaughnessy, and other families employed, but they don't point out that we have not got from these works as much value for the money as we should have done if the names of the people had been different. Well, I will take the House into my confidence in this matter. There are some half-dozen works throughout the whole districts where parties of the same name have been employed on the same works, but even that does not say that they are the same families. However, taking the money spent on all the works which have been under construction, on which parties of the same name have been employed, and what does it amount to? Taking the aggregate of the whole during the fourteen years it amounts to about five thousand dollars. Now, Sir, is it a great thing that during the period I have mentioned, in the course of which we have expended over \$1,300,000 covering 1,300 works, that is the most serious charge the hon. gentleman can bring against us? Then he complained as to the system of purchasing the supplies.

THE SUPPLIES ARE PURCHASED

in the same manner as they were under my predecessor, and whether they were purchased by my predecessor in that way or not, I contend that it is the best system that could be pursued. Now, Mr. Speaker, how are the supplies purchased? We advertise for tenders for the large supplies such as flour and pork and we accept the lowest tender, and for the smaller supplies we buy them in the open market where they are the cheapest. It has been said that we should buy the supplies in the neighbourhood where the work is being done. Now in the great majority of cases we could not buy the supplies where the work is being done if we chose, and I don't believe that the business men of the House will say that it would be wise policy for us to allow our overseers to buy the supplies on the ground. As I have said, the large supplies are bought in quantities by tender, and they are sent to the work as they are needed. There is a person in the Department who has charge of this work, and I believe that it has been well done, and the Province has got

FULL VALUE FOR THE MONEY EXPENDED.

The hon. gentleman does not pretend to show that we have not bought the supplies as cheaply in this way as it would be possible to get them by any other method.

Mr. MERRICK—Hear, hear.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—Well the hon. gentleman may say hear, hear. He does that to catch the ears of the merchants throughout the country, but I can only say that what little experience we have had of this way of making purchases has not been very fortunate, or of such a character as to lead us to the conviction that it would be advantageous to extend that system to any great extent. Again the hon. gentleman says that the work should be done by the municipalities themselves in which the work is to be performed, and here also I take issue with him. If you place the money in the hands of the municipalities to be expended as they think best you will not get the work as satisfactorily done as it is at present. You will find that the councillors living in the neighbourhood will have their views as to where the money ought to be spent, and that there would be greater disadvantages under that system than under the present, and I know of no system which will work as badly, on the whole, as the one suggested by the hon. member. The question has been discussed here, and the House has repeatedly pronounced against it, and when I have been in the country discussing the matter I have not found one single councillor who advocated such a manner of getting the work done.

Mr. MEREDITH—Hear, hear.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. His experience may be different, but I have talked this matter over with councillors, and I find that a majority say "Appoint good overseers, get good men to see that the work is well done."

WE DO APPOINT GOOD OVERSEERS;

we do get good men, and I believe that we get more work for the money than we could get in any other way. Then he says the affairs are managed politically. He says we appoint our friends to the position of overseer. Well, I hope many of them are our friends. We don't go round the country to hunt up our enemies.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Hear, hear.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—But we don't send the kind of men up there that hon. gentlemen had doing their work. We do not send any whiskey up there in large chests.

Mr. MEREDITH—That was frozen.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—But we appoint the best man we can find for the position of overseer, and if it does happen occasionally that the man is not a man of education he is always a practical

man, of sound sense and honest. He has said something also about the over-expenditure, and I am glad that this has been mentioned. I am glad that this discussion has arisen, because I can show that whatever has been done has been done in the public interest, or that we believed that it was in the public interest at the time it was done. Let us consider how much we have over expended in the fourteen years that we have had control of the affairs of the Government, during which time we have expended \$1,356,000 on colonization roads. During the whole time I have mentioned we have over-expended the sum of \$80,000, or an average over-expenditure of about \$6,000 a year. The only thing that surprises me, Sir, about this is that the over-expenditure has been so little, and that the expenditure has been kept so nearly within the estimates. Take into consideration the great demand there is for colonization roads, the pressure that is brought on the Government to expend money in this branch far beyond what

THE HOUSE IS WILLING TO SANCTION,

and the fact that this is the only means of developing much of the unsettled country, and you will not wonder that there has been some over-expenditure. It is almost essential in the very nature of things that there should be over-expenditure. It must be remembered that these roads are the only means of getting from one settlement to another, and when a road is commenced for which \$1,000 has been appropriated, it must go on even though its completion cost \$1,400. It would be a complete waste of money to allow it to be uncompleted because it will take a little more than it was first estimated to do the work. It is also almost impossible to estimate accurately the amount which will be needed to complete a work. I am always desirous, and the Government is always desirous, of having the work done for the lowest amount it is possible to do it for, and this sometimes causes the estimate to be under the amount of the expenditure. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough that the Opposition should point to the over-expenditure. They should, to make the charge effective, show that there has been extravagance or that the work could have been done for less. Now I have said that the hon. gentleman has made out no case, but he has said that the Public Accounts Committee have made out three or four cases where the party who had received the money had not signed at all. Well, suppose this has happened. There is no chance of the money not having been rightly spent, for the overseer has to take a solemn oath that the money has been expended

ACCORDING TO THE DETAILS SET FORTH.

Now, if hon. gentlemen wanted to be fair, if they wanted to treat this House as it ought to be treated, if they had any suspicion that there had been anything like fraud in connection with the expenditure, would it not have been their duty to have subpoenaed those parties whom they suspected of dishonesty to give evidence before the Public Accounts Committee? But hon. gentlemen throw out these insinuations, and try to make the country believe that they are well founded, without one single proof that the appropriation has been misapplied. I say it is not fair for the hon. gentleman to make these insinuations here unless he is prepared to give some proof for them. Now, some reference has been made to the purchase of provisions, and I think the hon. gentleman pointed out that we should employ the men and let them board themselves. That I promised to do last session. That I have carried out as far as possible last year. It is a better way than to provide tents and board the men by the Government. Let me point out the proportion of the supplies purchased in Toronto during 1883 and 1884, and the House will see that there has been a diminution. In 1883 pork, flour, and provisions cost \$10,561, as against \$7,682 in 1884, a reduction of \$2,879; groceries, \$3,978, against \$3,254, a reduction of \$724; hardware, \$2,256, against \$950, a reduction of \$1,306; blankets, \$906, against \$240, a reduction of \$666. The percentage of the cost of supplies to the expenditure in 1883 is 11 1/2, and in 1884 8 1/2, a reduction of 4 1/2 per cent. This course was adopted to the very fullest extent, and I propose to adopt it in every case when it is possible to do so, but it is impossible for us to get men in some cases where they can board themselves. It has been pointed out that we pay our overseers too much. Now, Sir, we pay our overseers from \$2 to \$3 per day, and these overseers are not mere idlers. They are workers themselves.

THEY ARE PRACTICAL MEN

chosen from the various localities. I keep the old ones as long as I can, and in employing new ones I always take the care to ascertain whether I am getting good men or not, and the great majority of overseers are hard-working, practical, honest, common-sense men. My only object is to secure the largest number of roads and the greatest amount of mileage for the money appropriated, and I contend that I have not been unsuccessful in this. I have produced more roads and bridges for the money expended than were ever produced before. We have constructed between two and three thousand miles of road, repaired about 4,000 miles of old road, built 200 bridges; and this has done more, as I have pointed out, to induce new settlers to go into the districts than any other expenditure the Government has made. For the

expenditure of this \$1,300,000 we have induced about 50,000 or 60,000 to go into this new district. It is said, Sir, that every settler is worth about \$1,000 to the country, and if that calculation is true we have added millions of dollars to the wealth of the country. We cannot stop this work. We have acted in a liberal way in the past, and we intend to act liberally in the future. My very best efforts have been given to the supervision of the work, and I am proud of what has been accomplished by the money spent while I have had control of this branch.

Mr. WOOD said that from his own knowledge in his constituency he saw the necessity of making a change in the system of management. There was a man named Aylesworth in the eastern part of the county, employed by the Department, who had taken direct means to debauch the electors in the interests of the Government. Such men as these should not receive an appointment. Again, in the township of Carlow, a gentleman named Wilson, a man of standing, had told him that a certain bridge was to be built. It was necessary to appoint some one to build it. The inspector called upon Mr. Wilson, and told him it would be to his interest to support the Government, and that if he would do so he should have the bridge at a certain price. (Cheers.) Such political partisans ought not to be appointed. A pure service could not be expected to grow out of such superintendence. There were many men of course who faithfully did their duty. There was a man named John Fitzgerald, in the township of Mounteagle, who had numerous brothers in charge of different works. A man was selected to build a road from Millbridge to the township of Mayo. He had been a strong Conservative and he got the job as soon as he changed his politics. Money was expended on this road for three years, and finally this man was dismissed as overseer, his misappropriation of the grant being so flagrant that the overseer was compelled to dismiss him. As to the supplies, the cooking stove required was purchased in Toronto and after being in use for two months it disappeared and could not be traced. He did not charge the Commissioner of Crown Lands with being personally aware of these abuses, but they were committed by his officials, such as inspectors and overseers. He favoured the proposition to allow municipal councils to expend the grants made in their districts.

Mr. MURRAY said he did not believe there was any expenditure that gave greater satisfaction to the people, nor did more good in promoting the settlement of the Province, than the one referred to. The grants given to the county of Renfrew were not as large as they should be. In fact, the opponents of the Government in his constituency blamed the Government for not giving more. At the nomination for the last election in South Renfrew Mr. Peter White, M.P. for North Renfrew, was there in the interest of the nominee of Dr. Dowling's opponent, and stated publicly that the County of Renfrew did not get its due share of grants for roads. He contended that as Renfrew had contributed so largely to the revenue from its timber dues that it was entitled to more. He (Mr. Murray) thought there was some force in that. The timber cut in Renfrew and adjacent to it for years past had been very considerable. He took the trouble of enquiring as to what the approximate revenue was from that quarter, and found in the seasons 1880 and 1881, 1881 and 1882, 1882 and 1883, that a few lumber firms on the Ottawa had paid into the Treasurer over \$100,000 per annum. He mentioned the amounts paid by one or two firms. J. R. Booth had paid about \$25,000, and McLachlin Bros., of Arnprior, had paid a like sum, so there was something in the arguments that a fair proportion of that money should go back to the settlers to assist them in constructing roads, particularly as a great many of these settlers located on free grant and other land amongst the pineries, with the understanding and belief that when the Government were reserving the pine that they would be assisted in making roads. It would be in the recollection of some hon. members that the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands got the last Parliament to amend the Free Grant Act and removed the limit which gave settlers the exclusive right to the timber. It was contended that the change was necessary in the interest of the license holders and for revenue purposes. The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands then stated on the floor of the House that it had been the policy of the Government to aid those settlers in opening up roads and that policy would be liberally continued so long as the finances of the Province would permit it, so that the Government of the day at least was in duty bound to keep faith with the people. He believed, notwithstanding what might have been said to the contrary, that the money had always been well and judiciously expended. The Opposition had questioned the mode of expenditure, and made it appear that if they were in power that they would allow the municipalities to expend the money. In the first place, colonization roads were often made where there were no organized municipalities, and in the next place it would be wrong for any Government to throw the onus of