

In conclusion, Mr. Conmee said it was a matter of congratulation that the Government, notwithstanding the growing wants and growing expenditure of the Province, had met all its obligations and was yet in a sound financial condition. It was proof that the Government was not extravagant.

The Budget According to Hoyle.

Mr. Hoyle, Conservative member for North Ontario, followed Mr. Conmee. He said that Colonel Matheson in his criticism of the budget had been both fair and candid and in conformity to general usage governing such matters, notwithstanding Mr. Conmee's very stringent criticism. Mr. Conmee had evidently yet to learn a great deal in connection with the subject of trust funds, which he had attempted to explain, and the speaker pointed out that \$10,000 had been paid for the expenses of an arbitration before the Supreme Court in connection with the claim made by the Province upon the land improvement fund. He quoted Hon. Edward Blake as saying, in connection with this suit, that there was no common school fund in the Dominion of Canada, and never had been any; that

the fund was really a fiction—a feat of bookkeeping, which had its origin in the laudable desire of the Province of Ontario to provide for primary education. As for the Government's contention that the moment the Province demanded it these funds would be paid over, Mr. Hoyle quoted Sir Leonard Tilley as stating that probably there was a method by which the Province could receive its share, yet the Dominion, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, being all interested, would require a tripartite agreement before anything could be done. What, then, became of the Government's contention? (Opposition applause.)

It would, Mr. Hoyle said, be an easy matter for the Government to make up its cash balance of \$450,000 by the sale of the Toronto Lunatic Asylum lands, \$42,000; the sale of railway annuities, \$128,000, and other items. He would never condemn the State for doing its duty by maintaining the unfortunates of the Province in its public institutions. It was not on these grounds that he was criticizing the expenditure. The Government was fond of comparing public institutions of neighboring States with those of Ontario, and he would in reply compare the cost of the executive of the Ontario Government with that of the Executive of New York State. The New York Legislature had five Ministers, and their salaries aggregated \$31,000, while Ontario's seven Ministers received, including the indemnities, \$35,200. "I have never," said Mr. Hoyle, "blamed the Government for its economy, as exemplified in the estimates, but if it is going to be economy it must be all around the table. (Conservative applause.) And I have no doubt that the time has arrived in the minds of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am daily expecting that some hon. gentleman there will have a motion before the Speaker for a bill to be read a first time reducing the amount that we pay the Executive of the Province of Ontario." (Conservative laughter.)

Mr. Hoyle went on to show that Michigan paid its entire Executive only \$7,400 in salaries ranging from \$800 to \$3,000. Mr. Stratton said there was no comparison between the duties in Michigan and Ontario, and Mr. Hoyle retorted that when Conservatives said there was no comparison in matters the Government sought to compare they were told they did not know what they were talking about. Mr. Whitney said the boot was now on the other leg, and Mr. Hardy intimated, in an undertone, that the argument hadn't a leg to stand on. Mr. Hoyle took the remark, apparently, as a personal reflection on his own extremities, for he said with warmth: "We have two good, sound legs, very nearly evenly balanced, on this side of the House—legs that will not be ashamed to stand upon the acts of this side of the House, and of a mental calibre also—(Government laughter)—to criticize in a fair and honest manner the extravagance which

we will endeavor to show is in existence upon the Government side of the House." (Opposition applause.) Mr. Hoyle then went on to demand an explanation of the phraseology "presently payable" in connection with the Government's statement of liabilities. It should include all liabilities, not merely those presently payable.

The contention of the Opposition was, he explained, that the only surplus was such as that shown by Sandfield Macdonald, who had a genuine cash surplus of \$3,814,000. (Opposition applause.)

Mr. Stratton—Where did Sandfield Macdonald get it?

Mr. Hoyle—From the revenues of the Province.

Mr. Stratton—From the sale of timber.

Continuing, Mr. Hoyle compared the record from 1871 to 1898, during which the Government expended \$3,500,000 more than its revenues. Referring to the administration of justice, he complained that the expenditure was on a constantly ascending scale, the increase in 1898 over 1897 being \$77,634, which ought not to be.

Favors Abolition.

He made the statement with deliberation that the Attorney-General would live to regret having returned to the system of junior County Judges, and, taking the full responsibility for his opinion, he urged that there is no need for a junior Judge in Ontario County, whose duties would not be sufficient to pay the salary attached to the position. The Government having indicated an intention to grant some reform of the administration of justice, he assured the Attorney-General that he would confer a great boon upon the people of the Province of Ontario if he would abolish the County Court system and expand and enlarge the scope of the Division Court system. As proof of the soundness of his argument he quoted from the statistics of writs issued to show that his suggestion was practicable, and declared that there is something radically wrong in the principle upon which the administration of justice is conducted. He also declared that the legislation respecting the payments of salaries to Judges under the heir and