

surer. Taking up Mr. Harcourt's comparison of the cost of maintaining Ontario asylums and those of the United States, he said that it was worthless, because the conditions were in no sense comparable. In the United States there were many wealthy patients, who were willing to pay for their care in these institutions, which were on a more extensive scale than ours. In addition the cost of living in the United States was greater than it was in Canada. He characterized as childish the argument of Mr. Harcourt that the Opposition, while now complaining of Government expenditures, had challenged a very small percentage of them. The late Opposition at Ottawa had challenged a much smaller proportion of all the monstrous and corrupt expenditure of that corrupt Government at Ottawa. Mr. Whitney denied that he had ever said that John Sandfield Macdonald's policy was to hoard up money. He had said that John Sandfield Macdonald's policy was a careful protection of the revenues of the Province, and that, having been able to save money, he was able to spend it. He had never advocated, as no man of common sense would advocate, the simple hoarding of Provincial revenues. The Sandfield Macdonald Government took account of their assets and sources of revenue and sat down and calculated what their revenue would be, and kept their expenditure within their revenue, and in so doing pursued the business policy which every business man must observe if he would not fail, and which the Government of the Province must observe. The Provincial Treasurer had stated in one breath that the surplus left by John Sandfield Macdonald was \$1,350,000, and then in the next breath he had said that he could show that it was less than that amount, but he did not fix the amount. The point of the Opposition is this, and he was never tired of stating it broadly, that no matter what may have or may not have been the expenditure of preceding Governments, the hon. gentlemen opposite have not hesitated to use up a portion of the assets of the Province of Ontario in erecting public buildings, and they take credit for the use they have made of them.

Anything but Direct Taxation.

Not only is the policy of the Opposition not "direct taxation," but is "anything which will put a stop to the coming of direct taxation," which is the effect and result of the continuation of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. He quoted from an editorial in The Globe in 1871 or 1872, which had been previously quoted during the debate, in which it was stated that the time had come for a halt, that the maximum of expenditure had been reached. The gentleman who wrote that editorial had, he declared, a proper sense of the true condition of the affairs of the Province. He (Mr. Whitney) knew and the hon. gentlemen knew that the people of this Province are thinking seriously of the financial affairs of the Province, and the supporters of hon. gentlemen knew it as well as those hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House, and the hon. gentlemen opposite took the matter seriously. If they did not believe the statements of the Opposition in this re-

spect, if the Opposition had not dealt in anything tangible, why did not his hon. friends opposite possess their souls in peace and allow matters to go along quietly and await the ordinary time for holding the elections? Why, it was intimated there that afternoon that hon. members will probably have to sit there and do business on New Year's Day, an unheard of suggestion. Could anyone imagine any excuse that can be given for bringing them back here between Christmas and New Year's except that hon. gentlemen are on the gallop for the elections. He warned hon. gentlemen that the sooner they get before the people the sooner will they obtain an expression of opinion from the people that they are unfit longer to continue to direct the affairs of the Province. The House had been called to do business but they had no business before them. The lumber question, they had been told, was an important one, of transcendent importance over all other questions before the people to-day, and that the members had been called together to take the opinion of the House upon it. They met on the 30th of November, and this was the 17th of December, and with respect to the policy of hon. gentlemen upon this question, the consideration of which they gave as a reason for calling the House together—

Hon. Mr. Hardy—When did we give that out?

Mr. Whitney, continuing, said that he did not say that the Government issued a proclamation to that effect, but hon. gentlemen who represented the Government in different parts of the country and their political organs did give it out. They had been there two weeks and nothing had been done. His hon. friend was between two fires. He is afraid to take the step; he knows full well what the desires and wishes of the people are, yet he hesitates to take what is sometimes called a leap in the dark. Hon. gentlemen on the Government benches had claimed that John Sandfield Macdonald was a Liberal. He knew more about that matter than hon. gentlemen did, and asserted that that hon. gentleman was in alliance with the Conservative party. The Liberal party drove him from office and drove him to his grave but a few years afterwards. The late statesman was a Baldwin Reformer, it is true, but there was a wide gap between that and the Reform party, and although he never called himself a Conservative, he could not be called a Reformer, and was in alliance with the Conservatives.

The Vice of Parsimony.

The Treasurer boasted in a rollicking way that the Government would not yield to the vice of parsimony, which was a proof of their attitude towards the finances of the Province. Were they the parties to be the custodians of the resources of the people? Nobody suggested that there should be any hoarding, but every person who had the welfare of the Province at heart would insist that the resources of the Province should be carefully guarded and that the expenditure should be kept well within the income. To say, as the Treasurer had said, that the late Dominion Government, which the Opposition had supported for eighteen