

lowed him. The hon. gentleman had made reference to the sales of timber by tender last year and would give to the country the impression that the Government are selling timber by inviting tenders instead of by auction. The hon. gentleman knew that the sales which took place last year were of burnt timber, and it has been the custom when portions of the forest lands of the Province have been burned, and

they may be and are frequently sold by tender instead of by public auction. No one had ever objected to that course, but he did object that the hon. gentleman had endeavored to lead the public to believe that it is the practice in all cases to sell timber limits by tender instead of by public auction.

#### Opposition Scandals.

Then as to the scandals to which the hon. gentleman had referred it is true that the Government have from time to time asked what are the scandals with which the Government has been charged. The hon. gentleman had chosen to accept this challenge, and had in the first place, he supposed it was his chief scandal, referred to the fact that a man named Coleman had been given a contract for the supply of coal to the Hamilton Asylum. What were the facts of the case? When tenders were received in reply to advertisements in all the leading newspapers of the Province it was found that there was a combine and he refused to accept them, thinking the price was too high. Instead of a loss of \$3,000 owing to the action of the Government there had in reality been a saving of \$1,200 to \$2,000, he could not give the exact amount speaking from memory, which was proved by the rate paid by the Hamilton schools for coal at the same time. The next scandal brought forward was that of Mr. John Scully, and he wondered that the hon. gentleman had brought up such a transaction as showing what he considered to be a scandal. The facts were that Mr. Scully had, at some trouble, made a sale of a large number of bricks manufactured at the Central Prison, which had been lying there in the piles for years and years. A good sale was made through Mr. Scully's instrumentality.

Mr. Marter—No, no.

Hon. Mr. Gibson, continuing, reaffirmed that Mr. Scully was instrumental in making the sale and the public accounts report would, he was sure, show that he was right, and the hon. gentleman opposite was wrong, and that Mr. Scully was entitled to the amount paid him for his services. The J. D. Simpson case was next called a scandal by the hon. gentleman, and it showed how hard up the hon. gentlemen opposite were for a charge. Was it fair to insinuate, as hon. gentlemen had done, that Mr. Simpson was shamming illness, that some doctor had been bribed to ruin his reputation for ever by giving a wrong certificate? He paid a high tribute to Mr. Simpson as a man of integrity, whose very bearing convinced anyone who heard his statements. The Brandon Company's case had also been referred to as a scandal. What were the facts? The business of this

company, who were operating the Central Prison industries, failed and the Government experienced a loss of at most \$4,000. Does any manufacturer in private life, he asked, expect to carry on business from year to year for a dozen years without suffering losses? That happened in this particular case to the Government, and it was the only case in which the industries had suffered a loss in any way. The hon. gentleman had also said there was a scandal in connection with the case of Walter Scott, who had been foreman of the industries for many years. He would not weary the House with any lengthy explanation of this, but would remark that the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had done more in the way of endeavoring to do mischief in the Central Prison and some other institutions, by the course he has felt it his duty to pursue, than anything else with which the Government had to deal. If a person was dismissed for misconduct it generally turned up that the hon. gentleman found him out, and wanted to know why the individual should have been dismissed, and in that way endeavored to make use of some dismissed servants.

Mr. Marter — Name some of them.

Hon. Mr. Gibson, continuing, took up the charge that the Crown lands officers' salaries had been reduced some years ago by the Premier owing to the action of the Opposition. Everyone knew that the work of the Crown lands agents had become less, and the salaries had been from time to time reduced by the present Attorney-General, because the reduction had, in view of less work, been justifiable. Assuming all this to be true, he asked the hon. member for North Toronto, "Is there any sense in putting such a case down in his list of scandals?"

#### Opposition Calculations.

Touching upon the question of the surplus, Hon. Mr. Gibson commented upon the method of computation adopted by the hon. gentlemen in connection with this question. They insisted upon doing what no child would think of doing in dealing with a matter of this kind; they would insist upon making out that the Province is \$4,000,000 in debt in respect of the railway annuities, when he knows that no county or township clerk in the Province would, if asked, "What are the liabilities of the municipality?" think of adding the coupons to the debentures issued by his corporation.

Hon. Mr. Hardy—He would be dismissed, just as hon. gentlemen opposite.

Hon. Mr. Gibson—Surely if hon. gentlemen added the payments for the next forty years on railways and annuities, they would allow the Government to add the interest upon their interest-bearing bonds for the forty years, and if the interest upon the \$5,000,000 for forty years is added, they would have \$8,000,000. That would, he thought, be a most reasonable proposition, because their trust funds are bearing interest.

Continuing, he said that the Opposition were not entitled to select the cash assets of the Province on the one side and set against them future payments on the other side. There would be the same reason for saying that at the pre-