

Perhaps the most interesting point of the whole debate of to-day was Mr. Hardy's exposure of the extraordinary and gross inaccuracies of which Dr. Ryerson was guilty the other day when he set out to prove that the Treasurer was wrong, in quoting the maintenance of prisoners in Ontario as being much below that of most similar institutions in the United States.

The Opposition speakers were Messrs. Whitney, Marter and A. F. Campbell. Mr. Whitney has always an effective manner of speaking, but to-day, as Mr. Hardy pointed out, he concerned himself principally with small matters, and made what could only be called an unimportant speech. Mr. Marter, speaking after recess, aroused more enthusiasm among the Opposition, and preferred some very heavy, though not very new, charges against the Administration. He spoke with his usual force and vehemence, and perhaps, it may be added, with a suspicion of recklessness and extravagance. Mr. Coumsee made probably the strongest speech he has ever delivered in the House, and uttered some very severe reflections on the member for Muskoka. Mr. Campbell of East Algoma followed his colleague of the western district in a rousing speech against the Government, his special points being that there was no surplus, and that the Government did not possess the confidence of the people. Mr. Gibson of Huron followed with a moderate speech, full of facts telling for the Government, and the debate was then adjourned.

FIRST READINGS.

To amend the municipal act—Mr. Guthrie.

To amend the assessment act—Mr. Whitney.

To amend the assessment act—Mr. Dack.

MR. WHITNEY'S SPEECH.

Mr. Whitney then resumed the debate on the budget. His remarks were nearly all directed against the statements of the Liberal members who had immediately preceded him in the discussion, he making the observation at the outset that he had unfortunately not been able to hear the Treasurer's speech, and that he considered that Mr. Clancy's reply had done away with the need for detailed statements upon the financial condition of the Province. Mr. Clancy, he thought, had with his battle-axe not only lopped the mouldering branch away, but had cut down the trunk as well and left only the blackened stump of the Treasurer's assertions. The budget speech he considered as a valedictory, and remarked that it was seldom so enthusiastic a valedictory appeared. He considered it a good thing that the Treasurer had adopted the plan of attaching to his speech statements which show that the Province is in debt, how much it is in debt, and when the debts fall due. It had been denied that there were any such debts until Mr. Harcourt had appended these statements. There were two or three items in the preceding speeches to which he would refer. For instance, Dr. Ryerson, in his speech, had made a slight error, and had admitted it when it was pointed out; but the Commissioner of Crown Lands had also made the mistake of saying that the townships in the Algonquin Park were not laid out in farm lots; Mr. Whitney citing the dates, ranging from 1880 to 1887, at which these surveys had been made. Dr. Ryerson's mistake was small in comparison with this mistake. Mr. Whitney then commented on the bookkeeping of the Treasurer's Department, pointing out that in 1883 and 1884 the receipts from the Dominion were all put together, and in 1885 the practice was adopted of putting in the item of interest from investments to give the impression that the Treasurer had saved large sums and invested them. Mr. Wood, Mr. Whitney went on, had in his brave attempt to criticize Mr. Clancy's speech, failed to deal with the accusations made, but had strayed off into a comparison of Sir Oliver Mowat and Mr. Gladstone; he had not refuted the charges of prodigal expenditure. That there was prodigal expenditure Mr. Whitney would prove by two or three items.

For instance, there was the department of colonization roads; the manner of making expenditures on roads and bridges was singular and unbusinesslike, and overseers were paid disproportionately; on one bridge the overseer's wages were \$119, the workmen's \$123 84; on another the overseer got \$196, the workmen \$183; on yet another the overseer received \$241 50, the workmen \$312 27; in another case the overseer's pay was \$133, the workmen's \$69 82; in another the overseer got \$24 50, the workmen \$14 62; and in another the sum of \$171 50 was paid to the overseer and \$92 93 to the workmen. There was to

much ornamental work there. Mr. Hardy then referred to the case of Mr. Simpson of that department, who was called to appear before the Public Accounts Committee, and who did not, sending in a doctor's certificate which on the face of it was false. The appointment of Mr. Noxon as additional inspector of prison industries was the next point on which Mr. Whitney touched, and he quoted largely from the report of the Public Accounts Committee to show Warden Massie's declaration that he had conducted all the preliminary business of the establishment of the binder twine industry, and that he believed himself fully able to run the department and Mr. Noxon's assistance unnecessary. Hon. Mr. Gibson's examination of the Warden, Mr. Whitney stated, was largely composed of leading questions. But Mr. Wood had not found time to speak of these, but had discussed the question of the relative merits of the Attorney-General and the retiring Premier of Great Britain.

Mr. Waters had spoken next, and had said that the Opposition were responsible for the expenditure, a declaration which did not square with the Ministers' declaration that they alone had anything to do with incurring expenses. When the Government were in a corner as to expenses they complained that the Opposition had not taken a vote on the item in question; and immediately after would tell the Opposition in reference to some other item that they had nothing to do with expenditure. Mr. Whitney then criticized Mr. Balfour's speech and rallied him especially on not taking action along the line of his speech in regard to the University and Upper Canada College. He closed by referring to Mr. E. F. Clarke's challenge to the Government to appoint a committee of investigation into the liquor license control in the city, and asked why it was not appointed if the Government were not afraid.

HON. MR. HARDY.

Hon. Mr. Hardy rose shortly before half-past 4 to reply to Mr. Whitney. The hon. gentleman to-day, he said, had exceeded himself; not by being more interesting and effective than usual, but by talking for an hour or more, and hardly touching on the real subject under discussion. He had touched on all manner of subjects except that which he had got up to discuss. His performance reminded him of the story of the Scotch professor who undertook to talk for half an hour or three-quarters of an hour on any given subject; to which his companion replied that that was a small thing to do, for his "auld wife at home" could talk all day without any subject at all. (Laughter.) Mr. Whitney reminded him of the "auld wife." He had dealt hardly at all with the principal issues brought up in the debate, confining himself to very little questions indeed, as, for instance, the construction of a bridge across a stream so small that the hon. member said he would rather wade it than use the bridge, simply to show his contempt for the latter. Mr. Hardy then referred to a statement of Mr. Whitney's to the effect that he (the speaker) had said the Algonquin Park was laid out in thousand-acre blocks, whereas it was really laid out in farm lots. Mr. Hardy said he had stated that the park was laid out in thousand-acre blocks, and so it was. That was the way in which the lines were run. These lines could be very readily used for timber purposes, and would aid greatly in the making of correct estimates. The department would get far more out of the townships surveyed in this way. The lines had not been run down into farm lots. He had not the slightest doubt the cost of doing this had been made over and over again. Mr. Whitney had referred to some of the statements made by the member for Toronto (Dr. Ryerson). Now, some of the statements of the hon. member for Toronto had not been very accurate, and he would correct some of the observations he had made the other day. Dr. Ryerson had stated that the cost per inmate for the maintenance of the asylum at Utica, N.Y., was \$97 91. He (the speaker) had already pointed out that this was wrong, the cost being really \$221 95. The paragraph containing the correct figures was only two paragraphs below that which the hon. gentleman had quoted. But this was not the only case of the kind. Dr. Ryerson had gone further. He had referred to the Binghamton Asylum and had stated the cost of maintenance there to be only \$74 per capita; the correct figures were \$183 60 per capita. He (the speaker) found these figures, the correct ones, in the same book from which Dr. Ryerson had taken his incorrect figures. Now, it was rather curious that there should be a repetition of these mistakes. It showed how carelessly and indifferently the hon. gentleman looked up his facts. Again, he had quoted the asylum at Rochester as being maintained at \$101 per capita. The real figures were \$223. Now,