

years, had had deficits, was a practical admission that the Ontario Government had a deficit. If they had not they should say so. Mr. Whitney, while reluctant to discuss Dominion affairs, said that the first year that the Liberal Government had been in power at Ottawa they had brought down estimates \$10,000,000 in excess of the last estimates of the Conservative Government. This statement Mr. Ross characterized as a Tupperism, whereat Mr. Whitney replied that he was content to let the people judge as between his veracity and that of Mr. Ross. The leader of the Opposition took issue with the statement of the Treasurer that there was timber enough to last for generations to come. Mr. Charlton had said that there was timber enough to last for 152 years, yet the Government was going on to spend money upon a scheme of reforestry. Mr. Whitney wanted to know what the attitude of the Premier would be when some of the Provinces made a demand for better terms in accordance with the telegram sent by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Mercier. Col. Matheson had said that for the last three years there had been deficits of \$400,000, aggregating \$1,200,000. This statement had been made last session by Col. Matheson in regard to the three preceding years, and it had not been contradicted by the Ministers.

Defence of the Old Chieftain.

He came to deal with the statements made by Mr. Gibson, prefacing his reply to the Commissioner of Crown Lands with an expression of the warmest personal feeling towards him. The Opposition leader defended the course of Sir John Macdonald in resisting the title of Ontario to the disputed territory. Sir John, he said, would have been false to his trust had he not championed the claim of the Dominion, whose servant he was. Sir Oliver Mowat while Premier had taken the side of the people of Ontario, notably in the Queen's Counsel case, but when he went to Ottawa he very properly appealed to the Privy Council on the other side of the question.

Mr. Conmee remarked that the Commissioner had not been complaining of the action of Sir John Macdonald, but of the attitude of the Ontario Opposition. Mr. Whitney said that the Bureau of Industries insisted that municipalities should make a return of their whole liabilities, yet the Government did not follow that plan themselves in making their financial statement. Mr. Gibson had complained because he (Mr. Whitney) had charged the Government with squandering the resources of the Province. He had looked up the word "squander" in the dictionary, and he had found that it meant "to spend wastefully or with foolish lavishness." There was no word in the English language that was more applicable to the course of the Government. Mr. Whitney then proceeded to justify the statements he had made at Hamilton in regard to the amounts paid overseers on colonization roads and bridges. He had, he said, sought to show the amount paid for inspection and for the labor which had been inspected. His remarks had been based on statements in the journals of the House that \$200 was paid for inspecting \$100 worth of labor. Mr. Whit-

ney denied that he had ever said that most of the useful legislation passed by the House had been due to Mr. Meredith and himself. He blamed it on the reporter, remarking at the same time that he had no fault to find with the accuracy of reports. He admitted, however, that he might have used the words at Shelburne quoted by Mr. Gibson, but he said that there were words before, between and after which meant something more than the bald quotation indicated.

Comparison of Cost.

His hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) had compared the cost of legislation and civil government between Ontario and Quebec and between Ontario and the Dominion. He charged that the hon. gentleman had made a most unfair comparison, in view of the fact that there are two Houses in Quebec and in the Dominion, and that in both the proceedings are printed in two languages, whereas in Ontario we had but one House and one language. His hon. friend had referred to the attitude of the Opposition upon questions which are now happily relegated to oblivion, and had unearthed and waved before them the red flag of intolerance. The hon. gentleman must take the results of his action in reviving a question which caused trouble between class and creed. He regretted that this action had been taken by the hon. gentleman who had charge of the education of the children of this Province. He strongly advocated a non-political Minister of Education, and declared that it is absolutely necessary and there is prime need for it, that the Minister of Education, the head of the department, should be in touch and in line, in accord, with public sentiment on the question of education, and should not be a man of such force of character that he must have his own way entirely with regard to everything in connection with the administration of his department. His hon. friend would have to do something to remove from the public mind the fact that last winter in this Legislature he had voted to reduce the quantity of liquor to be sold in stores to one-half pint. Reverting to the appointment of an Advisory Board to act with the Minister of Education, he pointed out that the appointment of the board would not deprive the Minister of one particle of his authority, and he should not be deprived of it, but surely the Minister would not object to have the assistance and advice of the leading educationists of the Province.

Hon. Mr. Ross—We have that now.

Mr. Whitney—Just so. The hon. gentleman the other night declared an Advisory Board to be contrary to the British custom of responsible government, and now he wheels around and say we have it now.

University Control.

Continuing, Mr. Whitney said he had never sought any gentleman connected with the University in his life, but for eight years he had been sought by them, and if hon. gentlemen opposite only knew the names of the gentlemen who had approached him they would be surprised. But these gentlemen had come to him in connection with various matters relating to education in