

great disc  
d for a yo.  
mber had affirmed that the figures were very accurate for the very best financier. The hon. member himself with this re-  
asylums were. Perhaps the cost of certain  
trusted to facts supplied by the cost of certain  
else, or perhaps he had not been  
cautious himself in looking at the figures.  
In any case, for a young member, who  
had been selected as a sort of leader on  
the opposite side, and placed over the  
heads of the hon. member for Kent (Mr.  
Clancy) and the hon. member for  
(Mr. Whitney), who had been pushed to  
the front as a great statistician, it was  
awkward that his statements should so  
mislead the House and the country. Per-  
haps the hon. member had been himself  
misled. Dr. Ryerson had been to some  
extent a teacher of youth. He had had  
something to say about the accuracy of  
vision. He was known as an oculist of  
repute. Perhaps the study of diseases of  
the eye had affected his own eyesight. Mr.  
Hardy then, amid the laughter of the  
House, suggested the names of a few dis-  
eases of the eye from which it prevented  
sibility that the correct figures from the re-  
port he had produced in the House the  
other day. He mentioned strabismus,  
concomitant, converging, etc., naming the  
particular symptoms of each, and finally  
suggested that Dr. Ryerson was suffering  
from a complication of these eye disorders  
and that his inaccuracy was attributable  
to this. The hon. gentleman, said Mr.  
Hardy, should be more careful. He should  
correct his observations in future before  
he ventured on submitting them to the  
House. (Applause.) Dr. Ryerson had also  
brought into the House on the same oc-  
casion a Division Court bill of costs which  
had been handed him. The costs amount-  
ed, he said, to \$11 75. He had given the  
issue of the summons at \$3, the execution  
of judgment at 75 cents, judgment sum-  
mons \$2 50, show-cause summons \$2 50, and  
warrant of commitment \$3, a total of  
\$11 75. Now, there was no charge for  
the warrant of commitment, nor any \$2 50  
for a show-cause summons. The items in  
the bill showed clearly that what Dr. Ry-  
erson had exhibited in the House was not  
any bill of costs in a Division Court suit.  
Somebody had been trifling with him, per-  
haps, or he had been otherwise misled.  
At any rate, there were no such charges  
as he had given. The full charges in a  
Division Court suit, including the cost of  
the bailiff, were only \$7 75, not \$11 75, as  
Dr. Ryerson had alleged. Now, \$7 75 was  
high enough, higher, perhaps, than it  
should be, and his hon. friend the Pro-  
vincial Secretary had a bill in preparation  
with a view to dealing with cases of this  
kind. He had drawn attention specially  
to these matters to show the hon. member  
for Toronto that it was unwise of him to  
come into the House and make statements  
into the accuracy of which he had not  
made careful inquiry. (Ministerial ap-  
plause.)

Turning again to Mr. Whitney, Mr.  
Hardy said that on the question of col-  
onization bridge overseers' charges the  
hon. gentleman had not stated the facts  
of the case. He had tried to make it ap-  
pear that there were overseers who had

done little or nothing themselves and had  
received large sums of money for their  
services, while very small sums were paid  
the actual laborers on the works. The  
hon. gentleman had been in the Public  
Accounts Committee and knew perfectly  
well that it had been brought out time  
after time that these overseers were se-  
lected for their mechanical skill in bridge-  
building, and had in the cases he mention-  
ed done the larger part of the work with  
their own hands, other laborers being em-  
ployed only to do such work as filling in  
gravel or stone.

#### CROWN LANDS CHARGES.

The hon. member for West Kent had  
made the observation that there had been  
expended as charges on Crown lands in  
1883 the sum of \$67,131, and in 1893 the enor-  
mously larger sum of \$97,193, an increase of  
45 per cent. The hon. gentleman was not  
dealing fairly with the House in select-  
ing the year 1883 for purposes of compar-  
ison. He had chosen the same year last  
session, and it had then been pointed out  
to him that there was \$11,000 on account  
of surveys incurred in and chargeable to  
that year which had been carried forward  
to 1884, making the actual and proper ex-  
penditure in 1883 \$78,230.

Mr. Clancy—The comparison was for the  
ten years previous and the ten years fol-  
lowing.

Mr. Hardy—Not on this point. As a mat-  
ter of fact, the hon. member had chosen  
the smallest year he could upon which to  
found his comparisons. He (Mr. Hardy)  
had prepared a statement showing the  
true figures as between 1883 and 1893,  
which he would give the House, but he  
was afraid the ingenuity of the hon. mem-  
ber for West Kent was such that he  
would be unable to find it. The corre-

expenditure in 1883, as he had stated, was  
\$78,230, while in 1893 it was \$97,193, an ap-  
parent excess of \$18,963 over 1883. The in-  
crease was accounted for by the fact that  
subsequent to 1883 they had acquired the  
new or previously disputed territory. Sur-  
veys in that territory of boundary and  
base lines, of timber limits and townships,  
had cost in 1893 \$2,614; timber agents and  
forest rangers, \$1,189; land agents, \$708;  
the new territory there these expenses in  
special services in 1893 in the old part and  
the Province in connection with burnt tim-  
ber, wood rangers, inspection and cul-  
lars, the sum of \$4,608; fire  
down to \$4,608 charged against the Pro-  
Government cost in 1893 was \$4,608; fire  
rangers, not in existence in 1883, \$2,528, and  
cullers act also not in existence in 1883,  
\$164, or on account of new territory and  
for new services in 1893 in all \$27,523. This  
left the expenditure in 1893 for the same  
services as in 1883 \$69,670, as against \$78,-  
230 for the latter year, or \$8,560 less, in-  
stead of, as the hon. member for West  
Kent put it, \$30,062 more—11 per cent. less  
instead of 45 per cent. more. That was his  
answer to the hon. gentleman's ques-  
tions as regards charges on Crown lands  
in 1883 and 1893. (Cheers.) The expenses  
of the Crown Lands Department in 1883  
were \$49,237; in 1893, exclusive of Bureau  
of Mines, which did not exist in 1883, they  
were \$49,655, an increase of \$417 only, or,  
including the Bureau of Mines, the in-  
crease was \$7,302. The revenue collected  
in 1883 was \$476,496, while in 1893 it was  
\$1,858,906.

Mr. Clancy—What has that to do with  
the cost?

Mr. Hardy—The hon. gentleman is a  
banker; did he ever handle any person's  
money without a "rake-off"? (Laughter.)  
Is it possible for any man, any commer-  
cial institution, any Government, to handle  
\$476,000 for the same cost as \$1,858,000?  
(Applause.) That they could not was ap-  
parent to everybody, but the blind man  
will not see.

There has been attack made upon the  
system of dealing with the timber of the  
Province, upon the quantity sold, the  
quantity cut, and the annual revenue re-  
ceived from this source. Strong language  
had been used; the Government were "de-  
pleting their assets," they were "wasting  
their capital," they were "making inroads  
upon the resources which ought to be  
preserved for the future." Is this in any  
sense true? It is true timber has been  
sold and cut, and that the Province is de-  
riving a revenue from it. The hon. mem-  
ber for West Kent says that from 1873 to  
1882 the revenue from Crown lands and  
timber was \$6,868,353, and from 1883 to 1893  
\$12,662,285, an increase during the latter ten  
years of \$5,793,932, or 83 per cent. He drew  
the attention of the House to the fact  
that the hon. gentleman included revenue  
derived from Crown lands.

But what is the use of throwing across  
the floor of the House the revenue of 20  
years in block lots? There is not implied  
in the accusation of the hon. member one  
single charge against the policy or the in-  
tegrity of the Government when he says the  
Government has collected \$19,470,638 from  
lands and timber during twenty years. He  
states that we have collected this enor-  
mous sum out of the capital of the coun-  
try, as though we stood alone in taking  
as revenue proceeds derived from timber  
dues, bonus and the sale of lands. Are  
we to stop selling land, or are we to stop  
considering it as revenue? What does the  
hon. member mean and intend the House  
to understand? Has any Government  
ever ceased to sell lands to those desiring  
to buy them? How could the Government  
refuse to sell land to the settler who  
wishes to make a home for himself, or to  
the miner for mining purposes? Is the  
settler to be met with a shotgun because  
he wants to buy land which is the prop-  
erty of the Province? Is the country  
to be left a wilderness, or should the Gov-  
ernment promote settlement? Let the  
hon. member say something more or some-  
thing less. It is unfair to lump together  
with timber revenue the proceeds derived  
from land sold to promote the opening up  
of the country and to treat this sum (\$3,-  
401,557) as being taken out of the capital  
of the Province. The taxes levied by the  
Dominion for twenty years might just as  
well be used as argument. The Dominion  
during that time wrung from the people  
by taxation not less than 590 millions,  
which was taken direct from the pockets  
of the people, and in addition they bor-  
rowed 173 millions, all of which they have  
expended. The hon. member would scarce-  
ly look upon these figures as argument,  
and yet they are more potent than those  
he had used. It is not argument, per-  
haps, except to show that taxation has  
been too high, and that more taxes have  
been collected by the Dominion Govern-  
ment than circumstances called for or the  
people were willing to pay. From the fig-  
ures of the hon. member there should be  
deducted the revenue from lands, \$3,401,-  
557, and \$1,838,931 (an error in calculation),