

Pick Your Jobs, Boys.

He pointed out the necessity of keeping pace with the growth of the Province, and, referring to the claim of the Opposition that the remedy lies in smaller expenditure, Hon. Mr. Davis asked where the reduction could be made, and the only reduction suggested by Mr. Matheson was to cut off one or two officials. He called attention to the fact that if every official in the Parliament buildings was to be dispensed with not one-half of the \$400,000 reduction which that hon. gentleman said should be made in the expenditure would be effected. In illustration of the sincerity of the cry of the Opposition for a reduction of the number of officials, Mr. Davis read from a fly sheet issued during the last general election in advocacy of the election of Messrs. Miscampbell, Duff, Thompson and Little, in which supporters of those hon. gentlemen were advised to "pick out your offices, boys." He asked how the hon. gentlemen proposed to reduce the expenditure for officials when they had promised all the offices to their supporters. Comparing the record of the Sandfield Macdonald Government with that of the present Government in the Department of the Provincial Secretary, he showed that salaries had not increased in the same proportion as the work of the department. The records showed that the expenditure of the Province had for some years prior to and including 1896 been reduced every year, but in 1897 and 1898 owing to exceptional expenditures on consolidation of statutes and elections there had been slight increases. One of the guiding principles of the Government had been economy—not false economy, but true economy in the expenditure of the revenues of the Province in the best interests of the people. He agreed in part with the assertion of hon. gentlemen opposite that they ought not to be expected to show in detail where they would make the reduction in expenditure. The people and the country, however, would demand that they show in a general way how it was proposed to make reductions. In passing he paid a high tribute to the efficiency and integrity of the officials of the Province. There are two ways of meeting the exigencies of the occasion—to draw upon the assets of the Province or to open up new sources of revenue. The Government could, he had no hesitation in saying, have drawn upon those assets, which now bear interest at 5 per cent., and for many years to come maintain the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. The Government had, however, decided, and wisely so, to seek new sources of revenue, and had adopted the principle, the soundness of which hon. members had unanimously admitted, of taxing public corporations. He denied that the City of Toronto had been badly treated at the hands of the Legislature, and pointed out that the City of Toronto and County of York in 26 years has received from the Government of the Province the sum of \$3,493,644 68, or an average of \$131,000 per annum, of which the City of Toronto alone has received \$107,000 per annum, and the amount is still growing. He appealed to Toronto and other municipalities to look at the matter justly and equitably in the interests of the Province.

Mr. Foy entered his protest against the provisions of the bill, which closed the door to Toronto in respect of future legislation with regard to the taxation of certain companies. If it was proper to introduce a bill now, it was proper to have done so a year ago, when the deficit ought to have been anticipated. The Government carefully abstained from going to the people with this measure of direct taxation, and appealed for popular support on the ground that they had a large surplus. The people took the Government at their word, and supported them in misapprehension of the true facts of the case. He moved the six months' hoist.

Mr. Pettypiece controverted the idea that the revenue bill was a blow at Toronto. The object was to reach several corporations having their headquarters here, which had hitherto largely escaped municipal taxation. According to the returns made to the Dominion Government the forty-four life insurance companies doing business in this country held real estate unencumbered to the value of \$4,900,000, and the net income of their business over expenditure amounted to \$5,335,000. In taxes, license fees and so forth they only paid \$55,000, or less than 5 1-2 mills on the dollar. That did not include personal property. The Province now asked these companies to pay \$44,000, or a total of \$100,000. These wealthy corporations should have been taxed long ago, and when the people realized how they escaped their obligations a demand would go up for further taxation.

Mr. Miscampbell declared that the Government was at the last resort, and was now seeking to relieve itself by direct taxation. The tax on life insurance companies would come out of the profits of these companies, and would be paid by the widows and orphans. It was an extreme measure.

The Division.

The House then divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:—

Yeas—Allen, Barr, Beatty (Leeds), Boyd, Brower, Carnegie, Crawford, Dempsey, Duff, Eilber, Fallis, Foy, Fox, Gallagher, Hodgins, Hoyle, Jamieson, Jessop, Joynt, Kidd, Kribs, Little, Lucas, Marter, Matheson, Miscampbell, Morrison, McDonald, McLaughlin, Powell, Pyne, Reid (Addington), Reid (Durham), Thompson, Tucker, White, Whitney—37.

Nays—Auld, Aylsworth, Beatty (Parry Sound), Blezard, Bowman, Bridgland, Brown, Burt, Caldwell, Campbell, Carpenter, Charlton, Clarke, Conmee, Davis, Dickenson, Douglas, Dryden, Farwell, Ferguson, Gibson, Graham, Guibord, Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Hill, Hislop, Holmes, Leys, Loughrin, Lumsden, Malcolm, Mutrie, Macnish, McKay, McKee, Pardee, Pardo, Pattullo, Pettypiece, Richardson, Ross, Russell, Smith, Stratton, Taylor, Truax—48.

The pairs were Messrs. Garrow and Carscallen, German and Wardell, Barber and Colquhoun.

The second reading was then declared carried on the same division reversed.