

the present Administration, and charged the Government with recklessly increasing the expenditures. Mr. Marter also contended that the Government must have contemplated during the last session of the House the present proposals for the increase of the revenue, and he considered that they had not acted fairly to the people or their representatives in withholding an announcement at that time. He did not criticize the bill itself, and his amendment was defeated on division, the vote standing 37 to 27. A number of clauses of the bill were passed, further consideration being laid over at the request of the Attorney-General, who stated that several delegations desired to wait upon the Government to-morrow in regard to some of the provisions. Substantial progress was made in a number of other Government measures and private bills, and it now seems certain that the business of the session will be finished by Thursday next.

#### Third Readings.

The following bills were read a third time and passed:—

Respecting certain by-laws concerning drainage in the Townships of Caledonia, Alfred and South Plantaganet—Mr. Guibord.

Respecting the incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Toronto—Mr. Pyne.

To amend the act incorporating the Smith's Falls, Rideau & Southern Railway Company—Mr. Matheson.

Respecting a certain by-law and agreement of the Town of Cornwall—Mr. McLaughlin.

Respecting the London Street Railway Company—Mr. German.

To authorize Jacob Zielinski to practise the eclectic system of medicine in Ontario—Mr. Hill.

Respecting the Town of Seaforth—Mr. Garrow.

To amend the act respecting cheese and butter associations—Mr. Dryden.

To amend the prisons and asylums' inspection act—Mr. Davis.

#### May Close on Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Hardy announced that there was a possibility that the business of the Legislature might be brought to a close on Thursday evening.

#### Liquor License Bill.

Hon. Mr. Hardy, in the absence of Hon. Mr. Harcourt through indisposition, moved that the House go into committee on the bill relating to brewers' and distillers' licenses. He explained that it was proposed to make a number of changes in the bill. Deputations representing the small brewers had waited upon the Government and had made certain representations. In consequence, the Government had decided that it would be only just to restore the minimum fee of \$250 on a business where the investment was \$10,000 or less. Another amendment provided for the addition to the bill of a clause whereby the license fee of taverns and shops could be paid half-yearly. A clause would likewise be added under which, if the distiller or brewer paid the maximum fee, he would not be called upon to make a return respecting his business. A further amendment of some importance provided that in cities where the license

fee in taverns and shops was increased by this bill no further duties should be imposed by the Councils of such cities; in other words, they should stand where they are under the provisions of the bill.

#### Mr. Marter's Address.

Mr. Marter, on the motion to go into committee, said that for many years they had been hearing from the Government of the splendid financial standing of the Province. Therefore, the present bills for adding to the revenues of the Province were a great surprise. The Provincial Treasurer had in 1897 told the House that the Government of Ontario had for years been able to show a surplus and in that year had a surplus of between two and three millions, and in 1898, continued Mr. Marter, the Provincial Treasurer had twitted the Opposition with charging that the Province was on the verge of taxation. But one year later the revenue bills they were now discussing were brought down. If the Provincial Treasurer had the knowledge this year that such measures were required, then he must have known of it in 1898, and that being the case he had done wrong in withholding such knowledge from the House and country. He considered that in view of the comparative smallness of the anticipated shortage there was no necessity for the Government to take up the time of the House in discussing these revenue bills. To him it did not seem possible that so astute a Government should come to the House, if the facts were as reported to be, an anticipated shortage of only \$207,580, and asked for the passage of bills which amounted to direct taxation.

#### No Reasons for Taxation.

One of the reasons given for the increase of taxation was that the cost of public institutions was growing. But what were the facts? In 1892 the cost of those institutions was \$813,435. Last year the expenditure was \$815,744, or less by \$2,691 than in 1892. It was impossible, therefore, for the Government to base the increase in taxation upon the cost of public institutions. The increase in the sum voted for education had been cited as another reason for greater revenue. That need was not substantiated by the facts. In 1888 the sum spent on the public schools was \$221,592. Last year the expenditure amounted to \$219,403, or a decrease of \$2,166. The Government claimed that the different institutions brought under taxation were only too willing to pay; that their coffers were overflowing, and they were glad to come to the Government's relief. Everybody knew, however, that since the revenue bill had been introduced deputations had been waiting upon the Government at all hours of the day and night, and asking for relief. The only parties satisfied were the electric light companies, the telephone companies, the street railway companies and other concerns who were pleased because the Government were taking less from them than they should rightfully pay to the municipalities. There had been a large increase in the cost of inspection since 1871 in education, and here, Mr. Marter contended, the people were not getting value for their money.