

was being debated in the House, Mr. Meredith had expressed the conviction that it was only right and proper that the present generation should not be called upon to pay the whole of these liabilities, but that a portion of the burden should fall upon the coming generation. Mr. Wood condemned Mr. Clancy's statement that the surplus was a myth and a rag baby. If the surplus was a myth where did the \$300,000 of interest come from? Any school-boy would know there must be a principal behind it. Mr. Wood closed with a few remarks laudatory of the general administration of the Province, but particularly of the financial administration, and predicted that at the approaching elections the people would again express their confidence in the Government.

Dr. Ryerson then spoke for the Opposition. He complimented the Treasurer upon the very able financial statement he had made the other day. He could not agree with him, however, as to some of his claims and arguments. He did not, for instance, think the succession tax had worked well. The Treasurer claimed credit because of the low cost at which the asylums were maintained. In Utica, for instance, the cost was only \$97.92, against \$135 per head for Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Hardy said he would like to see the book from which the speaker was getting these figures, and Dr. Ryerson said he would send it to him. Continuing, he said that so far from the figure for Ontario being a low one it was higher than in many American cities and States. In regard to grants to charities, the speaker objected to such grants being made to any sectarian institution. Who ever heard of a grant to a Presbyterian institution, or a Methodist institution? Now, last year the total grants to charities were \$151,000, of which amount the Roman Catholic institutions got \$54,000. Thus, one-sixth of the population got one-third of the money paid for charity. Dr. Ryerson was proceeding to quote the various grants when Hon. Mr. Hardy asked to be allowed to interrupt him for a moment.

The Commissioner for Crown Lands had been looking over the book from which Dr. Ryerson had taken the figures regarding the maintenance of the asylum at Utica. Dr. Ryerson had given the figure as \$97.92, but the Commissioner looking over the figures had found that this was exclusive of a miscellaneous collection of items, which brought the total maintenance up to \$221, as against the \$135 for Ontario.

Dr. Ryerson said, when the Commissioner had finished correcting him, that he had made a mistake, that was all. He then proceeded to quote the figures of the proportion in which the grants had been paid. He suggested to the Commissioner that he had better check his figures, as he might make a mistake. Dr. Ryerson claimed in regard to these grants that there was no reason for sectarian institutions being aided at all; that only institutions intended for general charity should be aided by the Government grant. The Opposition had been challenged to compare the financial standing of Ontario with that of other Provinces and States. They could do so. Take the Attorney-General's Department in Massachusetts; there \$9,000 are paid in salaries and \$2,781 in expenses; in Pennsylvania the salaries of that department are \$16,000, the expenses \$2,500; in Illinois the salaries of that department are \$8,100, and the expenses \$2,000; all of which are less than the cost of the Attorney-General's Department in Ontario. Dr. Ryerson then took up the question of the Patrons' platform and its similarity with that of the Liberal party. As for the public lands being reserved for the actual settler, the Attorney-General's opposition to Mr. Marter's motion of some years before showed him not in sympathy with that plank. As regards purity of administration, Mr. Noxon's appointment as extra prison inspector showed no great purity of administration. The record of the Government showed anything but rigid economy, he thought. The continued existence of imprisonment for debt was no sign of simplification of the machinery of law. He knew of a case where a man had been sent to prison over a debt of \$11.75.

Mr. Hardy offered to have the case investigated by the Inspector of Division Courts if Dr. Ryerson would give him the necessary information, and the doctor accordingly sent the memorandum across the floor.

Continuing, Dr. Ryerson turned to the Patrons' plank as to civil service reform, and held that the fee system is a proof that such reform is needed in Ontario.

Mr. Waters, replying, cited the commission of a short time ago, and showed that Dr. Ryerson's figures as to the comparative cost of asylums were incorrect. The average cost per capita per year in Ontario is \$125.24, as against an average cost of a large number of American asylums of \$220.08 per head per year. As for sectarian grants, in London, for instance, the general and Protestant institutions got \$6,950.92, the Roman Catholics but \$3,806.86.

Perhaps Dr. Ryerson would prefer to have no help given at all to Roman Catholics; but he did not see wherein charity suffered in coming through a Roman Catholic source. Mr. Waters went into detail over the figures of the grants and showed that in many of the Roman Catholic hospitals there were large numbers of Protestants. He trusted the people of Ontario would never allow sectarian principles to interfere with the dispensation of charity. (Applause.) He did not think any member of the House would deliberately say that because a charitable

institution was under Roman Catholic management, no matter whether it was properly managed or not, that therefore it should not receive aid just as if it were under Protestant control. Mr. Waters went into the matter of the increase in the cost of government. He gave figures showing that the Sandfield Macdonald Government had increased the cost of government during four years by 53 per cent.; whereas, during 21 years, the Administration of Sir Oliver Mowat had increased the cost of government by only 33 per cent. The hon. gentleman then touched on the financial position of the Province, showing that the surplus claimed by the Government was no myth, but an actual fact, and one that placed Ontario in a most enviable position. He then for a moment considered the expenditure in the various departments of civil government, legislation, administration of justice, education, charities, etc., and compared the figures for 1893 with those for 1873. In doing this he said it was difficult to say anything new, so full and explicit had been the statement of the Treasurer. There had been many excellent budget statements in the House, but none that were quite equal to that delivered on Tuesday afternoon last. Mr. Waters passed rapidly through the departments, glancing at the principal items, and showing that the growth of expenditure had been moderate and commensurate only with the absolute necessities of the Province. Mr. Clancy had compared the cost of government in '83 with that of '93. Now, the Opposition was equally responsible with the Government side of the House for all expenditure which they did not protest against.

Mr. Whitney—The Commissioner of Crown Lands says the Government is responsible.

Mr. Waters—Well, the Opposition is responsible too, and so you will find when you get on the stump. You can't get out of your responsibility in that way. Mr. Waters then ran over the years between 1883 and 1893, enumerating the various items to which the Opposition had taken objection. In several years there were no objections at all, but the total of items objected to during the entire ten years amounted to \$142,000. During the same period the total expenditure of the Province had been \$39,000,000. He thought this fact in itself spoke volumes for the position of the Government, and it would be a difficult one for the members of the Opposition to get over when they came to discuss the matter before the people of the Province. (Ministerial applause.)

At five minutes to 10 o'clock Mr. Whitney moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House then adjourned on motion of the Attorney-General.

THE PUBLIC WORKS REPORT.

The total completion of the new Parliament buildings is the chief topic discussed in the report of the Commissioner of Public Works. The sum set apart and appropriated for the construction of these buildings was in all \$1,265,000, and the total original contracts amounted to \$1,245,910. The details are:—

(1) Excavation, mason and bricklayers' works, etc., under Lionel Yorke and Carroll, Gaylord & Vick contracts (including 13,500,000 bricks from the Central Prison), \$752,250; (2) iron work, etc., for ground floor and basement of west wing under Lionel Yorke, \$4,643; (3) carpentry work, etc., of carcass of buildings, under Lionel Yorke, \$90,700; (4) wrought and cast iron work, etc., under St. Lawrence Foundry Company, \$54,000; (5) plumbing, gas-fitting, steam-heating, etc., under Purdy, Mansell & Mashinter, \$76,800; (6) lathing, plastering, etc., under A. H. Rundle, \$37,770; (7) slating, copper work, etc., under Douglas Bros., \$44,497; (8) interior wood-work, hardware, etc., under Wagner, Zeldler & Co., \$119,900; (9) interior painting, glazing, etc., under R. J. Hovenden, \$23,325; (10) grand stair-case, ornamental grille work, etc., under H. C. Harrower, \$21,991; (11) interior fire hydrants, pipes, etc., under W. J. McGuire, \$1,102; (12) drainage, etc., under Garson & Purcer, \$5,490; (13) tile work, under Toronto Granite Company, \$1,450; (14) decorative painting of Legislative chamber, under Elliott & Son, \$4,500; (15) mantels, grates, etc., under Rice, Lewis & Son, \$3,322; (16) seating of Legislative chamber galleries, under Rogers & Sons Co., \$3,250; (17) Speaker's dais, under Wagner, Zeldler & Co., \$920; making a total of \$1,245,910.

The entire cost of the work done under these contracts amounts to a grand total of \$1,257,985.10.