

ment, because when the commissioner of crown lands brought down and introduced the mining law to the house the session before last it received the cordial support of the leader of the opposition, and because when the commissioner last session proposed amendments he received the assistance and support of Mr. Campbell himself. There was not one dollar of royalty to be collected from anyone engaged in mining operations until seven years had elapsed from the

me that he had located his mine and commenced operations. Another feature of the law favorable to the miner was the small sum that was exacted to get a free title to mining lands. To anyone who earnestly proposed to engage in mining operations in this province neither the royalty nor the price per acre would be any barrier to him. Mr. Campbell had also found fault with the timber policy. The timber policy of the government was a policy which was pursued in accordance with the desire of the members of the house. If it could be established that favoritism had been shown there would be good cause to change the system of selling timber limits; but that had not been proved. Both the present commissioner and his predecessor had given evidence of their concern for the interests of the people. Mr. Hardy at the sale in October last had withdrawn a lot of timber when otherwise it would have been knocked down to a supporter of the government at a price which the commissioner did not consider sufficient; while Mr. Pardee, in defiance of the most influential lumbermen of the province, had increased the stumpage dues and the bonus per mile. Mr. McCleary had said that the government led the people to believe that they had in the treasury something which they had not. If any one upon the opposition side of the house—or on the Liberal side, for that matter—could substantiate the statement that the moneys put down in the treasurer's statement of the assets of the province were not the assets of the province—that there were no drainage debentures invested, that the Dominion bonds mentioned were not in existence, or that the capital held by the Dominion for the province has no foundation in fact and the Dominion is not liable to the province for it, then Mr. McCleary's remark was correct; but unless it could be established, that statement and others like it were untrue.

Continuing, Mr. Waters said that nothing concerned us more intimately than our financial position. He showed that when the Sandfield Macdonald administration was in power they pledged one and a half million dollars for railway bonuses, and this had not been paid when the present government assumed office. Altogether there had been expended for the encouragement of the railways of the province \$6,206,267. This expenditure was largely the cause of the prosperity of this country—aiding the opening up of the different sections, and affording facilities for conveying produce to market. The Macdonald government had left a surplus of three million dollars, and this amount had since been distributed to the municipalities. On colonization roads the province had expended the large sum of \$2,229,901, and Mr. Waters went on to justify the expenditure for charitable institutions. In 1878 the number of inmates in the asylums was 2,149, and at the present time the number was 39,085. The cost per head originally was \$135, while last year it was \$137 16, only a trifling increase for that long period. He gave figures showing that the government had very liberally aided education and public bodies, thereby greatly relieving the municipalities. He had made a calculation to find the expenditure per head of the population for legislation and civil government, and based on the census of 1881 it amounted to \$3 31, or 15 cents per head annually. He did not think that the people of Ontario could complain of such a low rate of taxation. It was a rather remarkable thing that the government should be in existence so long, and it was a somewhat singular thing that in spite of all the charges made the people of the province had not taken it into their heads to turn that government out. What was the reason? Well, the reason was that the great majority of the electors believed that the government was administering the affairs of the province in the interests of all classes, without partiality or favor. (Applause.) He complimented the hon. leader of the opposition on his ability and integrity, but called attention to the utter inability of either him or his followers to find any very serious defect in the government's policy or administration.

Mr. Miscampbell, member for Simcoe, followed with a good-natured speech, mildly censuring the administration in general terms, and mixing in a good deal of praise for the fine building they were assembled in, and the action of the minister of agriculture in establishing a dairy school, where the art of buttermaking might be acquired. He found fault with the educational expenditure, as he thought high schools were fostered at the cost of the common school course, in which the masses were so deeply interested. The government, he thought, should not receive so much credit for the good prices paid for the timber limits, as the price was regulated entirely by the law of supply and demand. While deploring the claims of the government to a large surplus, he promised that his side of the house would back up the treasurer in his determination to recover from the Dominion government the provincial trust funds held by them.

Mr. Garrow, member for West Huron, was warmly applauded when he arose to take part in the debate. Mr. Garrow is not in the habit of jumping up on every issue, and as his reputation for good judgment is high he always receives a close hearing. He did not intend, he said, to go very deeply into figures. It was a pretty difficult job to deal with a question of arithmetic from a party standpoint. That was the foundation error in a discussion such as was proceeding. It was admitted by both sides of the house that we had a substantial cash surplus, and we have an immense asset in the timber resources of the province. Suppose even that we had a small debt. What then? In what position does this province of Ontario stand as compared with the other provinces or with the Dominion itself?

The Dominion had heaped up a debt of \$300,000,000. Quebec had started even with Ontario and had now a debt of \$30,000,000, paying in interest alone \$15,000 annually. Was it not a fact that other provinces were going back at the rate of from a million to half a million dollars per year? Ontario was able to present a magnificent showing. What they claimed was that at the end of twenty years the Mowat administration was able, instead of a deficit, to exhibit a good surplus. This was something for which not only the government side, but also the opposition, deserved credit. They ought to be proud that they had been able to assist the province in reaching that glorious financial conclusion. (Applause.) It was a recognized fact that we must have expenditures for civil government, and whence was the revenue for this purpose to be derived? If the government did not deal wisely and carefully with the timber reserves, where could they look to for revenue unless they resorted to direct taxation? It was in their own interests, as well as in the interests of the country generally, that due care should be taken of all the sources of revenue. The system of disposing of timber limits to the highest bidder was one that commended itself to the good judgment of all, and it would be difficult to improve upon it. The revenue having been obtained, it was a paramount duty to see that it was economically expended. Now, it was very easy for hon. members opposite to occupy the position of destructive critics, but it was their duty to fully investigate the expenditure, to point out extravagance, bit by bit and item by item, instead of declaring in general terms once a year that the government was extravagant. Those members—(opposition)—were industrious and able, and had discharged their duty as well as they could. Where had they shown extravagance? It must be unearthed in detail. It had not been, and therefore they must assume that it could not be, and all the talk about extravagance must go for nothing. Members of the opposition could have ample time and facilities if they desired to investigate the various items of expenditure, and in the large expenditures for the erection of public buildings they had not brought to light any evidence of wrong-doing or over-expenditure. (Applause.)

MR. WHITE.

Mr. Solomon White, member for Essex, next took the floor, and proceeded to prove that the Sandfield Macdonald administration had been much more economical than the present government. From 1867 to 1871 the Macdonald administration had expended for civil government a total of \$381,665. During the following four years, 1872 to 1875, when the Liberals

came into power they expended in that branch of the administration \$591,557—almost doubling the expenditure. In the last four years the hon. gentlemen opposite had expended \$888,210 on civil government. He hoped this would satisfy