

THE OPPOSITION CAMPAIGN SHEET ANSWERED.

MR. SANDFIELD MACDONALD AND THE OPPOSITION.

(From the Toronto "Mail" Opposition Campaign Sheet, March 26, 1879.)

SANDFIELD MACDONALD opposed the Confederation scheme on the ground that it would result in too much government. However, when the British North America Act became law, and the union of the Provinces was consummated, he loyally accepted the situation, and served the country with rare devotion to the day of his death. Last summer, in a speech at Lindsay, Hon. GEORGE BROWN, who rebuked SANDFIELD daily from 1867 to 1871, recanted, and paid the dead statesman a worthy tribute. "SANDFIELD MACDONALD," said Mr. Brown, "was a man who would neither do wrong himself, nor allow those around him to do wrong. As first Premier of Ontario, SANDFIELD laid it down as his chief principle, that economy in Local affairs was necessary to the existence of the Federal system. Holding this view, he guarded the public chest jealously; indeed it has been said, and with some degree of truth, that his parsimony brought about his defeat. Had he spent the public money with a lavish hand, as his successors have done, he would have secured the allegiance instead of arousing the hostility of the powerful rings and combinations that always beset a full treasury. In 1869, while visiting St. Andrew's, in the County of Glenagarry, where he was buried three years afterwards, he was accused of "niggardliness" by a prominent local politician, and his reply is worth reproducing: "I admit I am niggardly. I deal with the public money as though I were dealing with my own personal funds. I am quite convinced—I took this ground during the Confederation debates—that an excessive or extravagant expenditure would in the long run lead the people to complain of the cost of Local government, and the next step would be the overthrow of our present governmental system. So long as I have the honour to be a member of the Ontario Government, I shall continue to be 'niggardly' for economy; the strictest and most careful economy is the sheet anchor of the Federal constitution."

MR. SANDFIELD MACDONALD NOT A CONSERVATIVE.

Nothing can be more preposterous, not to say impudent, than the claim of the present Ontario Opposition to inherit the virtues, or wear the mantle of the late J. Sandfield Macdonald.

Moses, Meredith, Morris & Co. are Tories, Conservatives, or Liberal Conservatives, to whom the very name of "Reformer" is hateful.

Mr. J. Sandfield Macdonald was a life-long Reformer. These men are the devoted and intimate followers of Sir John A. Macdonald, the Tory Leader at Ottawa.

Mr. Sandfield Macdonald was, until nearly the close of his life, bitterly opposed to, and the object of the bitter hostility of Sir John A. Macdonald.

Neither Moses, Meredith nor Morris was a member of the Local Legislature in the time of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald. When Mr. J. S. Macdonald was Premier of Ontario, Mr. Morris was a member of Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration.

The one member of the Local Legislature at the present time who can fairly claim a real connection with Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, is Attorney-General Mowat, his old colleague in 1862-3, and who now leads—not a Tory Opposition, but—a Reform Government.

When, on the 20th December, 1871, Mr. J. S. Macdonald moved a vote of censure on the yet incandescent Administration of Mr. Blake, his old followers, all save eleven, forsook him and voted against him. Thus repudiated, he would have no more to do with them, refused to attend a caucus to choose a leader, went home to Cornwall in disgust, and left them to elect—not a Reformer, but—a life-long Tory, Mr. Matthew Crooks Cameron.

It was as a Reformer Mr. Macdonald acted the part of an economist, and passed some liberal measures.

It was Tory associations that led him to usurp the authority belonging to Parliament, alienated him from old friends, and led to his downfall.

Only one of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's local Cabinet is in public life to-day. That one is his late Tory colleague, Mr. John Carling, now, as then, a Tory supporter of a Tory chief.

Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, as a member of the House of Commons, frequently refused to support Sir John A. Macdonald's Government, then in power. Mr. E. B. Wood frequently spoke and voted (as on the British Columbia resolutions) against Sir John. The only member of the Sandfield Macdonald Government that steadily supported Sir John at Ottawa was Mr. John Carling, by whose favour Mr. Meredith now represents London in the Local Legislature.

THE OPPOSITION AS ECONOMISTS.

(From the "Mail" Opposition Campaign Sheet, March 26th, 1879.)

"When this faithful public servant was defeated in the Legislature, a new order of things was established, and his successors, affecting to despise his policy of parsimony, launched out into excessive expenditure. The result bears witness to the accuracy of SANDFIELD's foresight. The public burdens have become almost intolerable, and men do not hesitate to say that we have far too much government. It is certain, unless a radical change is made, that the revolution he forewarned will spring up, and that before many years. The agitation against the cost of Local government is not confined to Ontario; it is general throughout the Dominion. In one or two of the Provinces they have abolished, or are about to abolish, the Legislative Council; while in others Local Union is proposed. The prevailing opinion in the Empire is referred to is that the Federal system must be processed at any cost, and it is felt that economy is the only means of salvation. This is also the view taken by the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature. Mr. Mowat and his followers saw the Ministerial gross throughout the Province, with a few notable exceptions, maintain, on the other hand, that the public burdens can be still further increased without straining the back of the taxpayer or impeding the existence of our present system. Indeed they hold that a sweeping measure of economy, such as the Opposition favour, would result in the destruction of this system. It is for the people to judge of the respective positions of the two parties, and give a decision in the best interests of the country."

PROFESSIONS NO PROOF.

A Tory in opposition is always virtuous. A Tory in power is always a spendthrift.

"When the Devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
But when the Devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

What assurance has the country that the present Opposition leaders in Ontario are economists?

Do mere professions or unbecoming resolutions prove their true intentions?

What are their associations, and in what school have they graduated?

When did they practise the doctrine that "Economy is the only means of salvation"?

They are the blind worshippers and followers of a leader whose performance as an economist have been as follows:—

WHAT THEIR GREAT EXAMPLE DID.

In 1854, John A. Macdonald became one of the principal members of the Canadian Administration, which succeeded that of Sir Francis Hincks.

There was a surplus in the Treasury when Sir Francis Hincks left office of \$1,600,000. \$3,600,000 stood to the credit of the Government for public works executed and the public debts redeemed out of surplus revenue.

In 1856, Sir John A. Macdonald became the Upper Canadian leader of the Government.

In 1857, TWO-FIFTHS OF THE WHOLE EXPENDITURE HAD TO BE MET BY BORROWING, to avoid showing a deficit of \$3,400,000.

The treasury was empty; the \$3,600,000 to credit was gone. The Government banking account was overdrawn to the amount of \$2,400,000.

The interest of the public debt had increased from \$1,200,000 to \$3,400,000, the whole of which, except about half a million, was chargeable against a net revenue of about 4½ millions of dollars.

In 1854, the entire expenditure, including interest and public works, was but \$4,160,000.

In 1857, it had been increased to \$7,600,000, in face of enormous annual deficits, by the guide, model, philosopher, and friend of the men who are now, the *Mail* says, preaching that "Economy is the only means of salvation."

These facts were all brought out by investigations before the Public Accounts Committee, &c., &c., at the time, and are now matters of history.

In 1858, the Revenue was	\$ 5,370,627
And the Expenditure	8,645,944

Deficit..... 3,275,317

In 1859, the Revenue was	6,597,017
And the Expenditure	8,091,761

Deficit..... 1,494,744

In 1860, the Revenue was	7,436,585
And the Expenditure	9,440,576

Deficit..... 1,973,989

In 1861, the Revenue was	7,543,926
And the Expenditure	9,542,834

Deficit..... 1,999,008

In 1862, the Revenue was	7,377,165
And the Expenditure	9,441,495

Deficit..... 2,064,332

Increase of Expenditure, in five years, in face of annual deficits, by the great chieftain of the party that declares "Economy is the only means of salvation".....	795,551
---	---------

Deficits in five years..... 10,907,390

The statements of Revenue and Expenditure from 1858 to 1862 are from a table prepared by Mr. Longton, the late auditor.

HIS NEXT GRAND ECONOMICAL ACHIEVEMENT.

From 1862 to 1864, Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Government intervened. From 1865 to 1867, John A. Macdonald again had a controlling influence in the Cabinet. And this is how he once more illustrated the doctrine that "Economy is the only means of salvation":—

In 1865 the expenditure was	\$9,993,957
In 1866 it was	10,834,813
In 1867 it was	11,381,950

Increase in three years by the head of the school which teaches that "Economy is the only means of salvation"..... 1,427,993

THE GRANDEST OF ALL.

In 1867 Sir John A. Macdonald became Premier of the Dominion. He held office until November, 1873, and was therefore responsible for the finances for 1867-8-9, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74. And this is the way he once more illustrated the doctrine that "Economy is the only means of salvation":—

In 1867-8 the expenditure was	\$13,485,092
In 1868-9 it was	14,038,084
In 1869-70 it was	14,345,809
In 1870-71 it was	15,623,081
In 1871-72 it was	17,589,468
In 1872-73 it was	19,174,647
In 1873-74 it was	23,316,316

Increase in expenditure in seven years effected by Messrs. Moreault, Morris and Co.'s model statesman and economist, on the principle that "Economy is the only means of salvation"..... 9,830,234

For expenditure from 1865 to 1874 see "Public Accounts," (Canada.)

And although the Revenue up to 1872-3 kept pace with the Expenditure, yet, in 1873-4, by adding four millions of dollars in one session to the permanent expenditure of the country, Sir John A. Macdonald exceeded his Finance Minister's own estimate of the Revenue for the year by no less than \$1,500,000.

So that an increased expenditure of \$9,850,324 in six years was Messrs. Moreault, Morris and Co.'s great exemplar's tribute to the doctrine that "Economy is the only means of salvation."

And their being the very humble followers of, and believers in, "Sir John," is absolutely the only claim and title those gentlemen have to be even suspected of being economists.

CANADA OVER GOVERNED.

TOO MANY EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS.

From the "Mail" Opposition Campaign Sheet, March 29th, 1879.

The Dominion, with a population of 4,800,000 people, is governed by a Governor-General, seven Lieut. Governors of provinces, and the Lieut. Governor of the North-West Territories—nine governors in all. We have sixty-five Executive Councillors, &c.

Dominion	13
Ontario	6
Quebec	7
Nova Scotia	9
New Brunswick	8
P. E. Island	6
Manitoba	4
British Columbia	3
North-West Territories	3
Keewatin	6
.....	95

Neither the *Mail* nor any of its party has ever proposed to abolish the office of Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. If there are too many such officers, it is to the smaller Provinces its exordiums should be addressed.

But how stands the account as regards Ontario and the alleged disproportionate number of Executive Councillors?

At Ottawa just now in order to keep up the thirteen ministers, the *Mail's* friends in power are dividing the Public Works Department and so will create an office for the Minister who, by the union of the Receiver General's Department with the Finance Department might, perhaps, be dispensed with.

Why does not the *Mail* protest against two Ministers at Ottawa being employed to do what hitherto has been accomplished by one?

The *Mail* takes 1877, as its year of reference:—Well, in 1877, Quebec (under Conservative rule) had

one Executive Councillor for every 170,216 of population.

Nova Scotia had one Executive Councillor for every 43,090 "

New Brunswick had one Executive Councillor for every 35,699 "

Prince Edward Island had one Executive Councillor for every 16,000 "

Manitoba had one Executive Councillor for every 5 to 6,000 "

British Columbia had one Executive Councillor for every 4,000 "

While Ontario with vastly greater interests had only one Executive Councillor for every 270,000 "

HOW IS THAT FOR ONTARIO UNDER THE NOWAT ADMINISTRATION!!!

TOO MANY LEGISLATORS.

From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, March 26th, 1879.

We have 460 representatives, the Executive Council included, viz:

House of Commons	296
Senate	27
Ontario Assembly	88
Quebec Assembly	65
Quebec Legislative Council	24
Nova Scotia Assembly	38
Nova Scotia Legislative Council	19
New Brunswick Assembly	39
New Brunswick Legislative Council	16
P. E. Island Assembly	28
P. E. Island Legislative Council	7
Manitoba Assembly	25
British Columbia Assembly	35
.....	699

This is one representative for every 6,000 souls, or one for every 600 voters, reckoning every tenth person a voter.

If the Opposition wanted to cut down the number of members, why did not they make a motion to that effect? When they did not, what right has *The Mail* to raise that issue at all?

However, let us see how in this matter Ontario stands as compared with other Provinces:

In 1877, (the year the *Mail* selects)

Quebec (under Conservative rule) had one

Legislator for every 13,483 of population.

Nova Scotia had one for every 6,800 " "

New Brunswick had one for every 5,200 " "

Prince Edward Island had one for every 2,700 " "

Manitoba had about one for every 800 " "

British Columbia had about one for every 500 " "

While Ontario with her great interests had only one for every 18,400 of population.

HOW IS THAT FOR ONTARIO UNDER THE NOWAT ADMINISTRATION!!!

COST OF LEGISLATION.

From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, March 26th, 1879.

The cost of Legislation, i.e. indemnities to members, salaries of the Speakers, clerks, &c., is as follows:

Dominion	\$250,000
Ontario	122,000
Quebec	168,000
Nova Scotia	30,000
New Brunswick	41,000
Other Provinces	50,000
.....	\$1,016,000

Here is another row of figures that will settle where "the shoe pinches" in this respect:—

In 1877, Dominion Legislation cost the people of Canada 17 cents per head.

In 1877, Quebec Legislation cost the people of Quebec 14 cents per head.

In 1877, the average cost of Legislation in the other Provinces was 15 cents per head.

In 1877, the cost of Legislation to the people of Ontario was only 7½ cents per head, and is now, by the reduction of the indemnity, less than seven cents per head.

HOW IS THAT FOR ONTARIO UNDER THE NOWAT ADMINISTRATION!!!

COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

The *Mail* complains of the cost of the Administration of Justice in 1877, and gives the following as the figures:—

For Ontario	\$280,000.
For Quebec	405,000.

In this connection, comparisons with small Provinces would be of little value.

The *Mail* is good enough, however, to invite the statement by its comparison, that the Administration of Justice in Quebec, in 1877 (under Tully rule) cost the people 34 cents per head.

WHILE IN ONTARIO IT ONLY COST THE PEOPLE 17 CENTS PER HEAD.

HOW IS THAT FOR ONTARIO UNDER THE NOWAT ADMINISTRATION!!!

COST OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

The *Mail* says that, in 1877, the charge for Civil Government was, for Ontario \$159,000, and for Quebec, \$165,000.

In this item, so fair comparison can be established between large and small Provinces, but it may be noted that the average cost of Civil Government to the five smaller Provinces of the Dominion, was just eleven cents per head of the population.

In Quebec (under Tory rule), the cost to the people of Civil Government, was 14 cents per head.

AND IN ONTARIO IT WAS, WITH A FAR GREATER AMOUNT OF BUSINESS, ONLY 10 CENTS PER HEAD.

HOW IS THAT FOR ONTARIO UNDER THE MOWAT ADMINISTRATION!!!

EDUCATION.

But the *Mail* has one arrow yet left in its quiver. It is happy in the discovery that the Province of Quebec actually spends less for EDUCATION than the Province of Ontario!

Ontario spent in 1877 on the education of its people and the relief of local burdens in this connection..... 34 cents per head.

And Quebec under the rule of a Tory government spent only..... 30 cents per head.

The Opposition are welcome to all the good they can get out of this line of advocacy; their organ has evidently in all its previous illustrations, "got the wrong saw by the ear" and PROVES THAT ONTARIO UNDER A REFORM GOVERNMENT IS THE CHEAPEST AND MOST ECONOMICALLY GOVERNED PORTION OF THE WHOLE DOMINION, BOTH AS TO MEN AND MONEY.

As to Education, it is a very good old Tory idea to object to that vote, but Liberal-Conservatives will hardly thank their champion for putting them in the category of opponents to a liberal expenditure for Education.

ONTARIO AND THE STATES.

The *Mail* tries to make it appear as though Ontario were less economically governed than the United States.

There are only FIVE American State Legislatures in which the proportion of legislators to the population is slightly less than in Ontario.

The cost of legislation in —

Connecticut, is	21 cents per head.
Pennsylvania	17½ " "
Massachusetts	16 " "
New York	12½ " "
Illinois	9 " "
Michigan	8½ " "
Wisconsin	8 " "
Maine, over	8 " "

And in Ontario is now under 7 cents per head.

HOW IS THAT FOR ONTARIO UNDER THE MOWAT ADMINISTRATION!!!

The information as to the cost of State Legislation is obtained from the respective State Departments.

BIENNIAL SESSIONS.

The *Mail* hints on Biennial sessions being adopted as in some of the American States. It will be time enough to discuss this

question when any responsible representative of the party the *Mail* supports comes out as an advocate for Biennial Sessions, and the other radical constitutional changes this suggestion implies.

THE MINISTERS' SALARIES.

(From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 21, 1879.)

In 1871 the salaries of Ministers were as follows:

Premier	\$4,000
Treasurer	3,200
Crown Lands Commissioner	3,200
Public Works Commissioner	3,200
Provincial Secretary	3,200
Minister of Education	4,000
	\$20,800

The salary of Dr. Ryerson, Commissioner of Education, is included in the above for purposes of comparison, because that Department is now in charge of a sixth Minister. The *Globe* used to complain that these salaries were exorbitant, yet Mr. Mowat did not hesitate to increase them at a time when the revenues could ill afford it, and when economy would have been the first object of a true Reformer. The increase was as follows:

Premier	\$5,000
Treasurer	4,500
Crown Lands Commissioner	4,500
Public Works Commissioner	4,500
Provincial Secretary	4,500
Minister of Education	4,500
	\$25,000

Or an increase of \$5,200 a year. Last session the Premier, anxious to make a show of economy on his death-bed, reduced the salaries to the following amounts:

Premier	\$5,000
Treasurer	4,500
Crown Lands Commissioner	4,500
Public Works Commissioner	4,500
Provincial Secretary	4,500
Minister of Education	4,500
	\$25,000

So that the total is still \$4,200 more than the total of the Cabinet salaries under Sandfield. The Opposition made determined efforts from time to time to reduce these and other salaries. Last session (Votes and Proceedings, 1878 p. 275-286), they moved a series of resolutions to that effect. Mr. Meredith moved as follows:—

"That in the opinion of this House, the salaries of Ministers should be \$25,500, with \$1,000 additional for the Premier."

THE OPPOSITION APPROVED THE INCREASE.

The Salaries of the Ministers were increased, in the Session of 1875-6, with the express approval of every Opposition member in the House, including Mr. Meredith, the mover of the resolution of last Session.

WHAT THE GREAT ECONOMIST AT OTTAWA THOUGHT ABOUT SALARIES.

The Salary of the Premier of Ontario to-day is only equal to the amount which Sir John A. Macdonald in 1873 declared wholly insufficient for a Cabinet Minister at Ottawa to live upon.

In that year Sir John A. Macdonald secured an increase of the whole thirteen salaries at Ottawa from \$8000 to \$17,000, with another \$1,000 for himself as Premier. (See Statutes Canada, 1873.)

His official income to-day is, including his indemnity as a member of Parliament, \$2,000, or \$4,400 a year more than that of the Premier of Ontario, and his colleagues all receive, although

two or three of their offices are all but sinecures, \$3,000 a year more than either of the Ontario Ministers.

The Salaries at Ottawa were raised when there was no surplus for the coming year anticipated, the expenditure of 1873-4, as provided for by votes of the House of Commons and Statutory Enactments in the Session of 1873, being nearly \$2,000,000 in excess of the anticipated revenue.

Every dollar required by the Dominion Government for expenditure on capital account had to be borrowed; enormous additions to the public debt had to be made in fulfilment of national engagements every year; and every dollar of additional current expenditure had to be raised by increased taxation of the people.

In 1876, when the Salaries of the Ministers were raised, the Revenue of the Province of Ontario was \$2,536,816, and the expenditure for current purposes, \$2,158,183. So that, in the year in which the *Mail* says "the revenue could ill afford it," there was, after providing for all the demands of the year—defending works of construction and other items that of Ontario would be charged against less on capital account—a clear surplus of \$387,633, equal, in proportion to Dominion Revenue and Expenditure, to a surplus of—in the year—\$3,000,000.

THE OPPOSITION SPEECHES.

The increase was strongly supported by the Opposition leaders and their followers. What they said on the occasion will be found at length in the *Toronto Globe* and *Toronto Mail* of Feb. 7, 1876. The following are a few extracts only:—

HON. MATTHEW CROOKS CAMERON, THEN LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION, said:—HE BELIEVED THE MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT WERE NOT SUFFICIENTLY PAID; AND THAT, AS HE HAD STATED WHEN THE MATTER WAS DISCUSSED WITH CLOSED DOORS, HE ENTIRELY APPROVED OF THE COURSE OF HON. GENTLEMEN IN THAT RESPECT."

MR. MEREDITH, NOW LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION, and the mover of the buncumbie resolution, quoted by the *Mail*, said:— "Though he had made no remark in reference to the matter when it had been discussed with closed doors, he wished to say that he entirely concurred in the observations made by hon. members on both sides of the House as to the propriety of the course the Government had taken. HE FELT THAT THE SALARIES PAID TO MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT WERE NOT ADEQUATE TO THEIR IMPORTANT DUTIES, AND TO THE IMPORTANT POSITIONS THEY WERE CALLED UPON TO FILL."

MR. SCOTT, OPPOSITION MEMBER FOR WEST PETERBORO— "Had been of opinion before he became a member of the House that THE SALARIES OF THE MINISTERS OF THE CROWN IN ONTARIO WERE NOT ADEQUATE TO THE POSITION."

MR. CREIGHTON, OPPOSITION MEMBER FOR NORTH GREY, and the compiler of Liberal-Conservative Political Almanacs, said:— "HE WAS OF OPINION THAT THE AMOUNT FORMERLY PAID TO MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE WAS TOO SMALL, AND THAT THE INCREASE WAS NOT BY ANY MEANS TOO LARGE."

DR. BOULTER, OPPOSITION MEMBER FOR NORTH HASTINGS, said:— "They had at last struck a subject on which they could all agree. HE BELIEVED THIS WAS A MOVE IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION, AND ONE WHICH HE BELIEVED THE COUNTRY WOULD SUSTAIN."

HON. WM. MACDOUGALL, THEN DEPUTY LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION,— "WAS SATISFIED THAT THE FIGURES PLACED IN THE ESTIMATES WOULD NOT ADEQUATELY REWARD GENTLEMEN IN THE POSITION OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE, CAPABLE

OF PERFORMING THE DUTIES OF THEIR POSITION. Looking at the expense of living in this city, and at the rewards of persons of similar attainments and devotion to duty, and at the labour and responsibility of their office, the salaries to be paid were very small ones."

MR. LAUDER, OPPOSITION MEMBER FOR EAST GREY,— "CONCURRED IN THE VIEWS OF OTHER SPEAKERS."

MR. BRODER, OPPOSITION MEMBER FOR DUNDAS, said:— "The people in the country, as a rule, HAD NO IDEA OF THE ENORMOUS DUTIES THAT MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE HAD TO PERFORM."

MR. DEACON, OPPOSITION MEMBER FOR NORTH RENFREW, speaking on the same subject on the 14th March, is reported in the *Toronto Mail* as saying:— "HE THOUGHT THE SALARIES OF THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS OUGHT TO BE AT LEAST \$5000 EACH. * * * He believed that the country and the House were of the opinion that the salaries of Ministers should be increased, and he thought the present Ministers would find themselves supported if they proposed this very necessary increase."

And in the *Mail* of Feb. 7, 1876, HON. MATTHEW C. CAMERON is reported as having said:—HE CONSIDERED IT HIS DUTY TO STATE HE HAD HIMSELF SUGGESTED THE INCREASE OF MINISTERS' SALARIES.

Moreover, commenting on the increase, the *Mail* itself said on the 5th February, 1876, "The Ministers' salaries are probably too low though Mr. Sandfield Macdonald and his colleagues never grumbled at the rate at which they were paid. But we think Mr. Mowat might have been satisfied with \$5,000, and the other members of the Cabinet with \$4,000."

So that the salaries of the Ministers to-day are exactly what the *Mail* said they ought to be in 1876; the reduction of their salaries by \$500 a-piece in the late session having been a perfectly voluntary act on their part.

The buncumbie resolution of Mr. Meredith consequently proceeded to reduce the respective salaries to \$500 a-piece less than the *Mail* admitted in 1876 to be a fair remuneration; to \$1,000 less than the Opposition leaders and Speakers in 1876 agreed was barely sufficient; and \$1,500 less than one of them declared Ministers ought to receive.

THE INCREASE JUSTIFIED ON ITS MERITS.

The increase was however defended then; and is justified now on its merits.

The salaries are no temptation to any competent set of men to accept the arduous, responsible and yet precarious office of Cabinet Ministers.

They are not half as large as the permanent salaries of the chief officers of many public corporations. They are less by 50 per cent than the salaries of ordinary city bank managers.

They are little more than half the amount of the salaries of the Ministers of the Dominion.

They are very much less than the salaries of other Colonial Ministers.

The Premier of New South Wales (population in 1876 estimated at 600,000) receives \$10,000 per annum; and each of his *senes* colleagues \$7,500 per annum.

The Premier of Victoria (population 712,000) has a salary of \$10,000, the Attorney-General, \$5,500, and each of the other *senes* Ministers, \$7,500.

The six Ministers of South Australia (population only 186,000) and of Queensland (population only 173,000) each receive \$5,000.

New Zealand has a population of 300,000, with six Ministers each receiving \$6,250 per annum.

The Premier of Ontario, with a population equal to that of

all the colonies just named, receives only \$5,000, and his colleagues \$4,000 each per annum.

It was such considerations, and the desire that public men should be fairly, although not extravagantly, remunerated for their services, that caused the increase of Ministers' Salaries to be regarded with UNIVERSAL APPROVAL, shared in, at the time, by the very men who now dishonestly and hypocritically propose its reduction, and the organ that uses it as an argument for turning out the present Ministers and putting Messrs Meredith and others who supported the increase in 1875, in their places.

AN UNTRUE SUGGESTION.

The *Mail* suggests that Reformers, in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time, contended that Ministers' Salaries were excessive.

It is not believed that any Reformer, with authority to speak on behalf of his party, ever made such an allegation. Reformers in Opposition did not wait until the eve of a general election before putting their views on record. No resolution was ever moved by the Opposition in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time that could give the least colour to such a statement.

THE SPEAKER'S SALARY.

[From the "Mail" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 21, 1875.]

In 1871 the Speaker was paid \$1,000 per session and \$450 indemnity, or \$1,450 for eight hours' work per day, for, on the average, fifty working days; or, three dollars and a half an hour. Under Belton his salary was increased to \$1,300 and his indemnity to \$800, so that he drew \$2,100 in all, or about six dollars an hour. Last session the indemnity was reduced to \$600, and the salary to \$1,550. Mr. SPEAKER, therefore, is now paid \$1,550 for his session's work, or something over four dollars and a half an hour for his services in the chair. Last session the Opposition sought to make a reduction here, and (Votes and Proceedings, 1875, p. 229) Mr. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. LAWRENCE, that Mr. SPEAKER'S salary be reduced by the sum of \$300, so as to bring it down to the original figure. This resolution was voted down.

In 1873, on the motion of Sir John A. Macdonald, the salary of the Speaker of the House of Commons at Ottawa, was raised from \$3,200 to \$4,000 a year.

At the same time the salary of the Speaker of the Senate was also raised from \$3,200 to \$4,000.

Nobody ever read in the *Mail* or heard any member of its party say that was a wrong step, or call upon Parliament to cut down those salaries.

The sessions at Toronto have, as a rule, during the past few years, been very little shorter than those at Ottawa.

The duties of the Speaker in both cases are *confusingly* throughout the year, as to various matters requiring attention and oversight.

The salary of the Ontario Speaker was raised in 1873, the year in which the increase took place at Ottawa, not only without opposition, but with the approval of members on both sides of the House.

And now when the Speaker had voluntarily proposed a reduction of his salary to \$1,250 for his twelve months' duties,—and not, as the *Mail* disingenuously puts it, merely for so many hours' attendance during a session,—the same men who approved the increase to \$1,550, tried to make a little political capital for themselves by voting to strike off another \$250.

THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S SALARY.

[From the "Mail" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 21, 1875.]

Another highly paid officer is the Clerk of the Executive Council. In 1871 he received \$1,000 a year; now he draws \$2,800. Last session

(Votes and Proceedings, 1875, p. 273) Mr. DEANES moved, seconded by Mr. SCOTT, in amendment to the resolution providing for the salaries, &c. of the Executive Council and Attorney-General's Department:—"That the resolution be not now concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the item of \$2,800 for the salary of the Clerk of the Executive Council and Deputy of the Attorney-General to \$2,000." This motion, which certainly would have done to injustice to the official referred to, was voted down by the Reformers on the division in which Mr. MANLY'S amendment respecting Ministers' salaries, &c., was voted down.

FALSE AND DISINGENUOUS ADVOCACY.

The *Mail* distinctly misstates this officer's salary in 1871.

It conceals the fact that as "Clerk of the Executive Council," in office he holds now, as he did then, with that of Deputy Attorney-General, he received \$400 a year for the former in addition to \$1,600 for the latter office, making together—not 1600 but—\$2000.

The *Mail* also omits to explain that, up to 1871, the gentleman in question had a considerable and profitable private practice he was allowed to carry on conjointly with his official duties, which practice he relinquished in consideration of receiving a salary reasonably remunerative for his whole services.

HOW OPPOSITION MEMBERS SPOKE AND VOTED IN 1873.

It also omits to mention that, on Mr. Scott's salary being raised in 1873, from \$2,000 to \$2,800, the increase was warmly supported by the Hon. M. C. Cameron and the Hon. Stephen Richard, both members of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Cabinet.

Mr. Cameron said:—"Under the circumstances he was prepared to vote for Mr. Scott's salary."

Mr. Richards said:—"To fulfil the position of Mr. Scott one must be as able and experienced lawyer. The Premier was a Chancery practitioner, and he (Mr. Richards) could readily understand why he should have associated with him, a gentleman well posted in Common Law proceedings. He thought that the salary of \$2,800 was not excessive considering the talent, experience, and industry of Mr. Scott."

On a hostile amendment being moved, the following members of the Opposition voted in favour of the increase:—Messrs. M. C. Cameron, Coyne, Hamilton, Meredith (now leader of the Opposition), Richards, Scott (Grey), and Williams (now Conservative Commons member for East Durham).

The office can only be properly filled by a lawyer of experience and ability.

The present Deputy-Attorney-General is acknowledged to be an excellent lawyer, a laborious public servant, and one who could earn by his profession, if in private practice, far more than his present salary.

Experience is a lawyer is everything; yet the proposal of the Opposition was to pay the Deputy Attorney-General \$500 less than the ablest men on their side held to be no more than adequate, six years ago.

At Ottawa, the Deputy-Attorney-General receives \$4,000. In addition to this the Clerk of the Council receives \$3,200. In Quebec, the Solicitor-General (an office analogous to that of Deputy-Attorney-General) receives \$2,800, with far less work, and is able to devote himself to private practice.

The business of the Attorney-General's Department, of which the Deputy is the chief executive officer, has enormously increased since 1871.

The motion to cut down the salary by \$300 was therefore not only unjust but evidently a piece of electioneering clap-trap, and as unnecessary, on the part of many who supported it, as it was unjust.

CENSURING ITS FRIENDS AND ITSELF.

The *Mail* condemns the payment to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of \$1,800 a year instead of \$1,400 as in 1872.

This increase was made in 1873, with the concurrence of all parties, and without any opposition.

It was regarded as only a just remuneration to a gentleman filling a very responsible office, which entails not merely seasonal but continuous duties.

No one then objected, no one has till now, objected to the increase.

It is only as a piece of pretty small election clap trap the item has been singled out for attack. However, to do so is to ensure not only the Government but the whole Opposition and Opposition Press, the *Mail* of course included, for allowing first the increase, and then the payment for six years, without protest.

No one ever heard of the *Mail* finding fault with the Clerk of the Commons at Ottawa being paid \$5,400 a year, or with a Tory Government at Quebec paying the Clerk of the House there \$2,000 per annum, with far less work than the Clerk at Toronto.

INSPECTOR'S SALARY.

(From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 21st, 1879.)

"In 1871 the Inspector of Public Institutions was paid \$2,000 a year, he now draws \$3,000. Last session (Votes and Proceedings, 1879, p. 281) the Opposition moved to reduce his salary to \$2,500 but their resolution was voted down."

And the Inspector does three or four times the work for the money.

There is no department of the public service that spends less in proportion to actual work done. There is no country where the same work is done so cheaply.

From a return made to the House last session the following facts relating to the business of the Inspector's office are taken.

In six years, 1871-1874, the number of Public Institutions inspected increased from 55 to 99, or 80 per cent. The number of statutory inspections made, increased from 104 to 150, or 56 per cent.

The number of prisoners committed to goals, thus adding largely to the Inspector's duties, increased from 6,615, in 1871, to 13,481, in 1877, or 103 per cent.

The Central Prison has become a new and very important feature in the Inspector's duties since 1871.

The average number of insane persons in the public asylums was 1940 in 1877, against 973 in 1871, or an increase of 103 per cent.

The patients and inmates of hospitals, &c., inspected, increased from 4,969 in 1871 to 8,193 in 1877, or 65 per cent.

The correspondence of the office increased 373 per cent. and other official business in proportion.

But no one who really takes the trouble to ascertain what the duties of the Inspector are, or what qualifications they demand, will pretend to say he is too highly remunerated.

The following gives a mere outline:—He is responsible for the due supervision and control of all the public institutions and asylums of the Province; of the Central Prison, the Penitentiary Reformatory, and of some forty gaols and lock-ups. He must investigate critically the affairs and operations of every hospital and charity receiving government money, some fifty in number. He must understand everything relating to prison construction and discipline; as well as to the care and general treatment of the insane and other afflicted classes. He is the legal custodian of lunatics' estates not otherwise protected. He buys all supplies, makes contracts, holds inquiries, franchises by-law, and has annually to see that every dollar of some \$500,000 is properly and economically spent and accounted for. Does anybody mean to say \$3,000 is too much to pay for all this? The whole cost of his office, including salaries, clerks, contingencies and travelling expenses is only some \$7,300 per annum.

No one denies the present Inspector is a most competent and faithful officer. How long would it take to lose a few hundred dollars, or thousands for that matter, if he were to be replaced by

an incompetent or dishonest one, in order to get the work done a little cheaper.

A VERY MEAN ATTACK.

(From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 21, 1879.)

"In 1871 the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands was paid \$2,600 a year, he now draws \$2,800. Last Session (Votes and Proceedings, 1879, p. 289) the Opposition moved to reduce it to \$2,500, but their amendment was voted down."

This is too bad. The increase of \$200 was made, in this case, in 1873, on the express appeal of Opposition members, led by the Hon. M. C. Cameron and supported by Hon. Stephen Richards. (See Toronto *Mail*, March 22nd, 1873.)

Now that Mr. Cameron is no longer in public life, and cannot defend himself, it is very mean to attack him in this fashion. And what is to be said of the attempt to make his act the ground of a charge of extravagance against the Mowat Government?

Crown Lands Expenditure.

The *Mail* attacks the increased expenditure of this Department, and very adversely contrasts it with a—recently—diminished revenue.

A very large proportion of the Crown Lands Territory yields no revenue at all, and yet is a source of more expense than lands sold outright.

The Free Grant system is greatly in the public interest, but it entails expense, with no revenue to meet it. With more townships opened to settlement, with a much larger area to be surveyed and patented, additional expense was unavoidable. The Free Grant townships open to settlement have increased from 55 in 1871 to 92 in 1878, with a corresponding increase in the acreage located and number of locations. More agents, consequently, must be employed, and more office work has to be done.

In the Woods and Forests Branch, although, under the influence of the existing depression the revenue has fallen off, the Department covers no less territory in its operations, and has an ever-extending area to guard and manage.

The Expenditure in Colonization roads, increased from \$55,409 in 1871 to \$85,612 in 1878, also involves a larger cost in management.

A bold charge of spending too much money against such a Department as this, is childish. If there is over-spending, it should be easy to point it out in detail. But no such attempt has been made.

Immigration.

(From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 21, 1879.)

The amounts spent on Immigration since 1876 are as follows:

1876	894,060
1876	45,291
1877	46,265
1878	31,975
	\$917,601

The Immigration reports show the following arrivals of immigrants in this Province:—

1875	17,655
1876	11,432
1877	11,654
1878	13,065

The per capita cost of each immigrant has therefore been as follows:—

1875.....	\$5 32
1876.....	3 95
1877.....	3 96
1878.....	2 44

This shows a considerable reduction; but it is difficult to make a comparison in this respect, for so returns are kept of the number of immigrants who leave the country after a brief residence. Since 1874, the labour market has been in a depressed condition. Hundreds of Canadians have been unable to find employment, and the expenditure of nearly a quarter of a million to induce strangers to flock to an overcrowded market, is a fair subject for discussion. The Opposition have taken the ground that it was not advisable under such circumstances to make costly exertions to secure immigrants; while the Ministerialists, to whom the employment of European agents and of agents at the principal points in the Province gives a large amount of patronage, take the opposite view.

A TRUE ADMISION.

The *Mail* here admits:—

- (1.) That the expense on Immigration has been largely reduced since 1874; and,
- (2.) That the cost of each immigrant to the Province, notwithstanding that, with a reduced number, the average cost per capita would be likely to increase, is only \$2.44 per head.

The figures speak for themselves. "Since the labour market has been in a depressed condition" the only assistance toward immigration rendered by the Government has been limited to farm labourers with families, and domestic servants. The only assistance ever given is free railway passes to their destination in Ontario, and meals when necessary.

But the *Mail* suggests that nobody knows how many leave Canada for the States instead of settling here.

Its friend, Senator Macpherson, says, that the immigration is made up by tramps from the States coming here.

Which of the two authorities is speaking the truth?

Is there any more reason to suppose that our immigrants have been flocking to an already over-stocked market than that they went there when everything was busy and inviting on the other side?

The immigration to the States from Europe fell from some 450,000 in 1872 to 158,000 in 1877.

It is notorious that numbers of persons have returned to Europe in consequence of the scarcity of labour in the States.

Does this look like an exodus of Canadian immigrants to the States?

What the public will most appreciate is, that the cost of an immigrant, whose value to the country is estimated by Dr. Edward Young,—late of the Statistical Bureau at Washington, and now the Tariff adviser of Mr. Finney Minister Tilley at Ottawa—at \$800,—is only \$2.44, thanks to the prudent and economical management of the Mowat Administration.

Mr. Donaldson, Dominion Immigration Agent at Toronto, who owed his original appointment in the public service so far back as 1861, to the Conservative party, has, in his reports for the last three years, borne the highest testimony to the superior class of immigrants passing through his agency, to the well-to-do condition of many, and to the demand for the services of all who wanted work being in advance of the supply.

With the influx of settlement in the Free Grant districts, and the migration of so many farmers and farmers' sons to Manitoba, in addition on the part of the Government would be criminal and suicidal.

The *Mail* conceals the fact, although it is stated in the report of the Department, that, in addition to the immigrants reported by the agencies, in the numbers above given, as coming into Canada, the following were reported as arriving by the Customs' authorities, namely: 1876, 7,691; 1877, 6,225; 1878, 4,885; making a total of 19,123 in 1876; 17,879 in 1877, and 17,940 in 1878. Only those through the agencies, however, are included in the estimate of average cost.

In answer to the sinister suggestion as to the amount of patronage involved in the appointment of agents, it is only necessary to say, that there is only one Ontario agent in Europe; and that the agents in Ontario are limited to five; one travelling agent, who meets the immigrants at Quebec; and four in the Free Grant district, at the magnificent salaries of \$100 a piece.

See Public Accounts; Immigration Report, &c., &c.

The Financial Position.

(From the "Mail" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 1, 1879.)

THE FINANCIAL POSITION.

The following table of the receipts and expenditure from 1868 to 1878, shows an enormous increase in the expenditure; and an increase, too, out of all proportion to the increase in revenue.

	Receipts.	Expenditure.
1868.....	\$2,500,000	\$1,182,400
1869.....	2,623,200	1,444,500
1870.....	2,700,700	1,580,700
1871.....	2,831,200	1,810,900
1872.....	3,460,800	2,220,700
1873.....	2,912,300	2,940,800
1874.....	3,446,300	3,571,500
1875.....	3,120,500	2,654,500
1876.....	2,580,500	3,149,000
1877.....	2,482,000	3,117,400
1878.....	2,254,400	2,002,400

It will be seen that since 1874, the expenditure has largely exceeded the revenue, the excess being as follows:

1874.....	\$425,200
1875.....	445,000
1876.....	551,400
1877.....	655,400
1878.....	648,000
Total.....	\$2,735,000

GROSS MISREPRESENTATION.

The *Mail* adopts the same line as Senator Macpherson and other unscrupulous critics, who seek to make out that the expenditure has exceeded the revenue, by charging the surplus distribution, and other special payments, against current revenue.

"It will be seen," it says, "that since 1874, the expenditure has largely exceeded the revenue," and then gives the figures.

Now, in 1874, the first payments were made under the Municipal Loan Fund Distribution Act, a measure every one,—the *Mail* and its friends included,—admitted to be a just and proper mode of dealing with the surplus funds in hand.

In 1874 the amount paid under the head of Municipal Loan Fund Distribution was \$1,361,101.

In that year the *Mail* dishonestly alleges there was a deficit of \$425,000.

It pretends to show this by including, in the moneys paid during the year, the sum of \$1,561,101 above mentioned, which was simply the people's accumulated savings handed back to the people.

If a man who, by saving a couple of hundred dollars a year out of his income, had managed to pay by a thousand dollars in a bank, drew it out and built a house with it, any person who ignorantly alleged he was, in consequence, that year spending more than his income by \$1,000 would be laughed at. If he did it to injure the credit of the economical man who so invested his money, he would be called a libeller.

In 1875, the sum of \$868,243 was handed over to the municipalities under the same Act. In that year the *Mail* falsely pretends there was a deficit of \$445,000.

So that in those two years, but for the deception thus attempted, the *Mail* would have to admit that there was, in 1874—not a deficit but—a surplus of \$236,101, and in 1875 a surplus of \$841,243, after providing for everything save Municipal Loan Fund Distribution alone.

The True State of Affairs.

THE REVENUE.

The actual receipts of the Province from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, have been as follows:—

1874	\$3,446,347
1875	3,156,605
1876	2,389,222
1877	3,227,699
1878	2,308,925
	\$14,728,798

But from this must be deducted \$748,837, the amount of money temporarily borrowed on the advice of Sir John Ross against a pending sale of securities. The operation was a profitable one to the Province, but the item is only in Revenue as a matter of account. That leaves—

\$13,979,941 as the actual Revenue for the six Years.

These figures are given in a comparative statement of receipts and expenditure presented to the Legislature last Session, verified by the signature of the Auditor.

THE EXPENDITURE.

The following sums were voted by the Legislature to meet current expenditure, and are all to be found in the Supply Bills of the respective years:—

1874	\$2,343,339
1875	2,063,550
1876	2,155,185
1877	2,363,806
1878	2,408,834

Total expenditure under the Supply Bill \$11,333,414

The account then stands as follows:—

Revenue for the six years	\$13,979,941
Expenditure	11,333,414
Surplus	\$2,646,527

But the *Mail* adds to the expenditure in order to establish a deficit of \$2,735,000, the following payments:—

Aid to Railways under special Acts of the Legislature	\$1,470,596
Municipal Loan Fund Distribution	3,225,378
Purchase of Rockwood Asylum	96,500
Common Guel alterations paid to Municipalities	67,850
School of Practical Science (special account)	33,267
Osgoode Hall improvements (a special account)	34,860
Refunds of Brewers' Licenses under decision of Supreme Court	5,442

Total Expenditure as against surplus for special objects, and falsely charged by the *Mail*, against annual Expenditure \$4,932,873.

Worse Still.

The organ of the Opposition, in its party campaign sheet, does not stop there. It even charges against current expenditure, in order to deceive the public, the investments in 5 per cent. Municipal Drainage Debentures; as good a security as any in the Province, and ranking as a first-class asset in the Treasurer's financial statement.

The sums invested in Drainage Debentures, and in Drainage Works, payable by a rent-charge on the lands drained, amounted in the five years to no less than—

\$417,589,

which must be added to the

\$4,932,873,

making altogether

\$5,350,462

dishonestly charged by the *Mail* to annual expenditure, in order to manufacture a bogus deficit.

A Comparison between 1871 and 1878.

(From the "*Mail*" Opposition Campaign Sheet, April 1, 1879.)

The sums spent on what is known as capital account, i.e., on public works, special fund outlay, etc., and on purely controllable expenditure, have been as follows:—

	Capital Account.	Controllable Expenditure.
1868	\$ 138,000	\$1,045,540
1869	428,000	1,046,000
1870	483,100	1,092,000
1871	503,800	1,223,100
1872	738,100	1,482,600

	Capital Account.	Controllable Expenditure.
1873	1,175,400	1,765,400
1874	2,084,900	1,780,400
1875	1,777,100	1,827,400
1876	1,245,400	1,895,200
1877	1,114,400	2,003,000
1878	844,900	2,058,400

This table makes it plain that, capital account expenditure aside, the controllable expenditure has risen under Reform rule from \$1,223,100 to \$2,058,400—an increase of 835,300, or nearly 70 per cent.

The *Mail* attempts, by mis-using the phrase "controllable expenditure," to create a false impression.

The whole of the expenditure under the Supply Bill is, in one sense, "controllable," but that term has usually been applied to the following items:—Education, Immigration, Agriculture, &c.; Hospitals and Charities, Public Buildings, Public Works, and Colonization Roads.

Under the head of "Ordinary Expenditure" are classed the following:—Civil Government, Legislation, Administration of Justice, Maintenance of Public Institutions, Miscellaneous, Crown Lands Expenditure, Refunds, &c.

1871 compared with 1878.

In 1871 (Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's last year of office), what is called "Ordinary Expenditure" amounted to	\$833,176
And what is called "Controllable Expenditure," &c.	983,630
Total	1,816,806

as against \$1,195,030, the amount, under these two heads, spent by the same Government in 1878.

Or an increase in four years of more than fifty per cent.

In 1878, the "Ordinary Expenditure," so called, was	\$1,268,57
And the "Controllable," so called, was	1,139,954
Total	\$2,408,533
The aggregate increase over 1871 was, therefore,	\$581,667

Or thirty-two per cent. in seven years against fifty per cent. in four years.

But, under the head of "Ordinary" expenditure is included the charge for maintenance of public institutions: just as direct a relief to local and municipal burdens as Education, and some other items charged under the head of "controllable." This item increased from \$171,423, in 1871, to \$482,468, in 1878, amounting for \$311,000 of the apparent increase.

Education, too, under the head of "Controllable," rose from \$351,396 in 1871, to \$506,056 in 1878, amounting for another \$200,000 of the alleged increase.

A Favourable Comparison.

While the increase in the charges for all purposes was much less proportionately from 1872 to 1878, than from 1868 to 1871,

the expenditure for objects directly beneficial to the public, and exclusive of surplus distribution, was much greater. Take the following items:—

1868 to 1871.

Education	\$1,276,507	or	\$318,889 per annum.
Maintenance of Public Institutions	631,551	"	157,888 "
Colonization Roads	177,900	"	44,475 "
Agriculture and Arts	296,788	"	71,697 "
Hospitals and Charities	161,570	"	44,942 "
Total in four years	\$2,533,566	or	\$633,391 per annum.

1872 to 1878.

Education	\$3,506,958	or	\$800,964 per annum.
Maintenance of Public Institutions	2,375,364	"	539,338 "
Colonization Roads	664,867	"	94,981 "
Agriculture and Arts	636,924	"	90,989 "
Hospitals and Charities	380,905	"	54,400 "
Total	\$7,564,918	or	\$1,890,729 per annum.

Comparison.

1868-71—Aggregate expenditure on above items	\$2,533,566	or	\$633,391 per annum.
1872-78	7,564,918	"	1,890,729 "
Increase			\$447,311 per annum.

So that the Blake and Mowat Administration spent FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS annually on these objects alone in excess of the sum devoted to the same objects by the previous Government.

Whatever increase has taken place in Departmental expenditure has been solely owing to the growth of public business.

But the absurd ground on which it is now sought to snatch a verdict against the Mowat Government is that it has spent the people's money for the direct benefit and relief of the people.

A Miserable Quibble.

The *Mail* tries to raise a side issue by quibbling over the question whether, in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time, the Trust Funds held by the Dominion, and some other assets, were or were not regarded as a portion of the surplus.

The point is really of no importance whatever. Treasurer R. B. Wood, in his last Budget speech, Feb. 7, 1871, (see papers of that date), expressly alluded to those funds as part of the surplus in the public treasury, which, he alleged, amounted to \$8,000,000, including \$3,500,000 in cash and investments, and the "Funds" aforesaid. This was before \$1,500,000 had been voted to be "set apart" for aid to railways.

The Two Surpluses 1871-1878 compared.

But here is the actual account, as it stood on the 31st Decem-ber, 1871, taken from the public records:—

Investments and Special Deposits	\$3,637,979
Cash Balance	172,985
Special Trust Funds with Dominion	2,786,418
Ontario's share in Library at Ottawa in 1867.....	106,541
Gross assets.....	\$6,702,923

Less the following Liabilities:—

Sums since ascertained to be due to Quebec under the award	\$ 138,596
Railway Aid Fund voted and embodied in a Statute in 1871.....	1,500,000
Total Liabilities.....	\$ 1,638,596
Net surplus assets.....	\$ 5,064,327
Taking exactly the same items, Mr. Treasurer Wood in his late Budget Speech shows the Assets on the 31st Dec. 1878, to be	\$0,842,748

And the Liabilities	1,411,755
Leaving, after providing for every obligation a surplus of	\$4,430,993

And that, too, after distributing under the Municipal Loan Fund Adjustment Scheme, \$3,225,378; and \$779,024 in aid to Railways over and above the amount appropriated by the Sandfield Macdonald Act of 1871.

If then we take the exact surplus at the end of 1871, and the same at the end of 1878, we shall find that *over Four Millions of dollars from accrued surplus* (in addition to the \$1,500,000 originally voted for Railways) *have been paid to the people by the present Government* for those two objects, with the effect of reducing the surplus as it stood on the 31st Dec., 1871, only \$633,324.

The whole of the foregoing statements are taken from the Public Accounts or other official documents.

As shown by Treasurer S. C. Wood, in his Budget Speech, no less a sum than **\$17,560,570** has been distributed since 1871, among the people for public objects, independent of the cost of Government and numerous other charges.

See Budget Speech, 1879, page 46.

And the liabilities
 Liability after providing for every
 obligation a surplus of \$4,430,000

And that too when liquidating under the proposed plan
 Total A's investment, \$2,500,000; and \$719,937 would be
 returned over and above the amount appropriated by the State.
 Held Macdonald Act of 1871.

If then we take the exact surplus at the end of 1871, and the
 sum at the end of 1872, we shall find that over \$2,500,000
 of dollars have entered surplus in the \$1,500,000
 originally voted for the (B's) and has been used in the
 liquidation of the State's debt with the effect of an
 almost complete discharge of the surplus as it stood on the 31st Dec. 1871, only
 \$433,937.

The whole of the foregoing statements are taken from the
 Public Accounts or other official documents.

As shown by Treasurer E. C. Wood, in his Budget Speech
 no less a sum than \$17,860,510 has been distributed since
 1871, among the various public objects independent of the
 cost of Government and numerous other charges.

See Budget Speech, 1873, page 46

Investments and Special Deposits \$3,637,970
 Cash balance 171,562
 Special Taxes Funds with Reserves 5,786,418
 Government's share of Interest on Debts in 1867 169,541
 Other items \$6,102,937

Less the following liabilities:—

Debt then amounted to be
 due to Government for
 loans \$ 1,365,500
 Railway and Road works
 and embedded in a 5%
 loan in 1871 1,500,000

Total liabilities \$ 1,636,500

Net surplus assets \$ 3,064,937

Telling exactly the same story, Mr. Tans
 says Wood in his late Budget Speech
 shows the facts on the 31st Dec. 1873
 to be \$3,612,748