

Cabinet as a pea-jacket Government, a definition in which the Opposition entirely concurred. Looking up the dictionary, he found that a pea-jacket was a coat worn by seamen in very stormy weather. (Opposition laughter and applause.) There was another definition of a pea-jacket which did not appear in the dictionary. It was a coat that Canadian boys wore when they went skating on thin ice. (Opposition laughter.) In view of the meaning to be attached to it, the speaker thought Mr. Ross would not thank Mr. Holmes for characterizing the Government as a "pea-jacket" Government.

Delay in Timber Policy.

The speech from the throne contained the statement that the Government's sawlog policy was wise and timely. The policy was not adopted by the Government in time. It came years after it should have been introduced, and in the meantime our people were losing the employment and wages they otherwise would have enjoyed. The legislation was wise, inasmuch as when it did come it followed what had been laid down as the true principle years before by the Conservatives. The policy adopted in regard to pulpwood was cognate to that of sawlogs. It was a protective policy, and in putting it into

force the Government had adopted the old Conservative principle of protection for Canadian industries. (Opposition applause.) The Ontario Government were thus journeying in the wake of the Liberals at Ottawa, who, after reviling protection for years, turned round and adopted it almost in its entirety. (Opposition applause.) The Government had passed an order in Council requiring nickel and copper ores to be refined in the Province. Mr. Blue, the Director of Mines, estimated that during the last seven years \$14,000,000 was derived from these lands. Of this amount only some \$4,000,000 went to the people of Ontario, who were the owners of the mineral lands, while no less than \$10,000,000 went to the United States. If this policy was a proper thing to adopt now, it should have been put into force years ago. Did the Government not stand convicted by their action at this late day, of neglect of the interests of the Province?

Mr. Foy took the Premier to task for stating that there was a surplus of \$400,000 as the result of the operations of 1898, whereas Mr. Harcourt, speaking in 1899, declared new taxation to be necessary, as the receipts did not equal the expenditure. Mr. Ross' statement simply was not warranted by the facts. (Opposition applause.) Some measures of reform in reference to the courts had been promised in the speech from the throne, and Mr. Foy hoped these would be introduced sufficiently early to permit of thorough consideration instead of being brought in at the closing hours of the session. He hoped the Government would see to it that some change would be made in the law so as to render it impossible for a defeated candidate to delay election proceedings so unduly as was the case in North Waterloo. That constituency was unrepresented last session, and it was without a representative this session also. The candidate was unseated in North Waterloo as far back as October 18, yet the case was not

yet ready for appeal. The constituency of West Huron was also tied up in a similar way. Mr. Foy said that the Government in making arrangements for obtaining concessions from railways that were bonused had adopted the policy advocated by the leader of the Opposition. The conclusion reached by the Government warranted the belief that the giver and receiver of last session's bonuses thought the sum granted was too much.

The Commissions.

Mr. Foy criticized the Government for the delay in issuing the report of the Financial Commission. Furthermore, there was great promptitude in issuing that commission, and much slow-footed delay in issuing the one referring to West Elgin. He believed there was not much demand for the first, while there was a general cry for the other. Public opinion and the country demanded a commission which would investigate all election charges in West Elgin. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Preston) had in fact understood that to be the case, and stated so on the platform in the presence of the Premier. The ballots had been burned on April 12 last. Why was the public kept in ignorance of the fact for ten months? The ballots and books were public property. Why this secrecy? The member for West Elgin (Mr. Macdiarmid) was not given fair play when he was not notified of the destruction of the ballots. The electors who had to vote in the recent bye-elections should not have had the fact concealed from them. Was it because of the bye-elections that the fact was kept secret? That probably explains why it was not made public, and also why the commission, which had been promised last fall, was not issued until January 31.

Commission Too Limited.

This limited commission, with its small scope, was not what was wanted. The irregularities set forth in the commission as within its scope were only a small part of what existed.

Hon. Mr. Stratton—Why did you not go on with your trial and show all this?

Mr. Foy—I think sufficient was shown at the trial by the evidence and by the confession to have unseated fifty or sixty candidates. (Opposition applause.) The Government, Mr. Foy said, had virtually said: "Don't touch Preston, Bole, Cahill and the rest of the gang. Only touch the returning officers and poll clerks. Inquire into all the charges, but don't touch the gang." It was not so much the local officers, but the system that ought to be got at. It was not too late yet. The Government could yet pass special legislation and give a commission that would give more satisfaction to the public.

The Surplus of 1898.

Premier Ross rose to explain that while the previous speaker had given him credit for saying there was a surplus of \$400,000 in 1898, as a matter of fact it was \$450,000, which with \$390,000 in 1899 made a saving of over \$800,000 in two years.

Mr. Foy replied that his point was proven by the Premier's statement. There were cash balances that had