

ernment to dissolve the House and appeal to the people. There was no reason why this course should be adopted; but when the Government did appeal to the electors in the usual course of events, and time had been given to work out their new policy, they would be triumphantly sustained. (Ministerial applause.) The Opposition professed to be anxious to put down corruption. The record of the Conservatives did not warrant the belief that they were sincere. The evidence justified the opinion that the Conservatives were more anxious to secure seats for their friends than to put down corruption. After the last general election Mr. Whitney declared there would be no sawing off of election petitions. In spite of this the Conservatives agreed to several "saw-offs." If the Conservatives were in earnest why did they not insist upon the cases going on? There was a saw-off in Mr. Whitney's case. Why did he consent to it? Was he anxious not to face the court or to condone corruption? Opposition speakers had protested that nobody connected with their party organization was identified with corrupt practices. In North Waterloo Mr. J. M. Scully, the President of the Conservative Association, had been reported for corrupt practices, and lately a summons had been issued against him to appear for trial.

#### The Timber Policy.

Mr. Miscampbell had made the claim that the Conservatives had been fighting the Ontario Government's timber policy for 25 years. As a matter of fact they had lent active aid to the Conservative Government at Ottawa in the attempt to rob Ontario of her timber. It would not have been wise for this Government to place an embargo on logs when a market existed in the United States for Canadian lumber, but the very moment legislation hostile to the lumber interests of this country was adopted on the other side, then was the proper time to strike. The Government took that course, with the most beneficial results. Something was being said about free logs for free lumber. Mr. Pettypiece thought the policy at present in force in the Province was the best for Ontario, and should be maintained. Mr. Marter had criticized the revenue bill brought in by the Government, but in the speaker's opinion eighty out of the ninety-four constituencies were heartily in sympathy with it. There were no reasons why the wealthy corporations of Ontario should not contribute to the Provincial revenue. The Opposition in their criticisms of railway grants seemed to wish to convey the impression that large sums of money had gone into the pockets of railways contractors. It must be remembered that not one dollar of the subsidies had yet been paid, and the probability was that many years would elapse before the money was earned. The railways would not be subsidized unless they were a benefit to the localities, and care would be taken that substantial returns would be exacted for aid given. Mr. Pettypiece approved of extending aid for the development of New Ontario, but pointed out that in doing this the Government were handicapped. The tendency of the Do-

minion Government's policy was to settle Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gave reduced rates to the west in order to settle the large areas of the land which they possessed. It behoved the Government, therefore, to redouble their efforts not only to obtain settlers for the new territory of this Province but to retain within Ontario those of its sons who were tempted to go elsewhere. As a matter of justice, however, New Ontario had strong claims upon the Government. It had yielded a revenue of some \$30,000,000, which had been expended upon public institutions and public works in the older districts, while New Ontario itself had received in return only about \$5,000,000. Mr. Pettypiece spoke eloquently of the struggle in South Africa, which he alluded to as one for civil rights and freedom. He expressed regret that Mr. Miscampbell, in referring to this matter, had so far forgotten himself as to act the partisan, and claim that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been forced by public opinion to send a contingent to South Africa. How different was the course at Ottawa, where the two veteran leaders crossed hands over the chasm of party strife, and united in paying tribute to Canadian valor and deploring the death of the brave men who had fallen. The events in South Africa were tending to bring parties closer together in regard to points upon which they had differed in the past, and the speaker hoped that in the future it would have the result of causing both sides to look more at questions of public interest from the point of view of the public good than that of mere party interest. (Loud Ministerial applause.)

#### Mr. Hoyle on Railway Grants.

Mr. Hoyle (North Ontario) began with a word of congratulation to the Provincial Secretary and the Minister of Public Works, the two new members of the Cabinet. Referring to corruption, he asked how it was that after so much money had been spent in instilling noble principles of education in the Province there was running parallel to the magnificent system of education such a carnival of corruption. Reviewing the railway subsidy question, Mr. Hoyle said the Premier had said it was desirable that Ontario should have a seaport. He then read from the Dominion report on Hudson Bay navigation, showing that such a thing was impracticable. He therefore felt that he had been justified in voting against a project of subsidizing a railway with valuable land for the purpose of obtaining something that was entirely chimerical. The Rainy River Railway, for which a large subsidy was given last year, ran 42 miles of its line through the State of Minnesota. He questioned the propriety of giving such an enormous grant to a line of railway that would pursue that policy. The railway question was of great importance. Under present rates the Glengarry farmer paid as much, or 28 cents per hundred, on cattle shipped to Portland as did the farmers of Minnesota and Dakota. The farmer of Essex paid 28 cents per hundred to