

Mr. Marter said:—Among the liabilities was the item of railway aid certificates, \$4,899,883.

“Mr. Hardy—It is not a liability in any sense, shape or form. The interest should not be added.”

What I said, continued Mr. Hardy, was: “The honorable gentleman includes interest running over forty years in order to make up the liabilities; that this should not be added; that if a municipality is asked for its debenture indebtedness it gives the amount of the debentures issued, but that no one ever heard of their adding the interest running over the term of the debentures—that this future interest should not be counted as a liability in any shape or form.”

Hon. Mr. Hardy announced that he expected the advance copies of the revised statutes will be placed in the hands of hon. members on Monday. The index is not yet complete, but the table of contents would enable hon. members to find any particular chapter. It would be of advantage to hon. members to be in possession of the new volume in order that whatever amendments they might have to suggest might be made to the revised statutes direct.

Mr. Haycock rose to emphasize the remarks of the leader of the Opposition as to the desirability of hon. members being informed at an early date respecting the intentions of the Government with reference to the period and duration of the holidays. He thought the members ought to be informed upon this point not later than Monday, of the date of adjournment and term of the vacation.

Hon. Mr. Hardy—Probably on Tuesday.

The Budget Debate.

Mr. Meacham resumed the debate on the budget, continuing his remarks from the point at which he left off at the hour of adjournment on the previous evening. Discussing the question of the existence of the surplus, he pointed out that the Opposition had good reasons for fighting this question. The Government speakers and press had been claiming all over the country that if the Government had erected public buildings, the Parliament buildings, and had still this surplus left after carrying on the government as well, they ought to be sustained at the polls. The charge which the Opposition made is that these statements are untrue, because they have spent more than their receipts. The hon. gentlemen opposite claimed that Opposition members were not justified in charging the railway certificates against the alleged surplus, but surely if they were right in their contention they would agree that the annuities, the money which they borrowed to meet them, should certainly be charged against the surplus. Upon the question of expenditure on colonization roads, the foremen employed on these works were paid large amounts per day, and there was no inducement to them to hurry on the work. The Government were the protectors of the officials rather than of the people, and he cited a case where complaints had been made upon the floor of the House against the interference of officials in the elections. Speaking of the expenditure upon the Department of Agriculture

Mr. Meacham mentioned the fact that this department was formerly a sub-branch of the Treasurer's Department.

Hon. Mr. Ross reminded the hon. gentleman that the Government did not want it to continue as a sub-branch, as it is important enough to be a full branch.

Mr. Meacham continued, pointing out that the Government was representing to the country that the Opposition was opposed to the creation of the office of Minister of Agriculture. This was not so, and in support of his contention he quoted from a resolution and speech of Sir William R. Meredith, when leader of the Opposition, upon the matter, and asserted emphatically that the Opposition did not oppose the appointment of a Minister of Agriculture.

Opposition Methods Condemned.

Mr. Garrow thought that a great deal of what the House had heard during the debate had not been uttered by hon. gentlemen so much with a desire to clear up the questions under discussion, but rather to mystify. He had heard the same arguments advanced for some eight years, and had been forced to the conclusion that a great deal of the contentions advanced is humbug. This is a business question pure and simple, and the conclusion at which every man who investigated that question for himself from the material before him, rather than the stump oratory of politicians, must be forced to arrive is that the present Government, whether it be a Liberal or a Conservative Government, is an honest and a business Government. It was a lamentable thing that after three or four days' debate they had received no suggestion from hon. gentlemen opposite, with the single exception of that made by the hon. member who had just sat down, respecting the setting apart of incurable inmates of asylums with a view to the improvement of accommodation and saving of the cost. He (Mr. Garrow) thought perhaps there might be something in the suggestion, and he commended it to the attention of the hon. gentleman who had charge of the department, if indeed it has not already been looked into. The question of the appointment of a Minister of Agriculture had been introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite. What has this question to do with present-day politics? he asked.

But, since the other side had brought it up, he desired to say that it was not that the Opposition utterly and entirely opposed the appointment, but that they sought to belittle and curtail it. They held—that agriculture, the great industry of this country, was not to be put upon the same footing as the other departments, that it should be a sort of annex to some other busy Minister; that was good enough for the farmers, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, but this was not the view of hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House. The Opposition did not dare to say “no” to the appointment, but were unwilling to have an Agricultural Department. He challenged the hon. gentleman if he knew of misconduct by Government officials to report the matter to the department as his duty. The Govern-