

care, as I said before, whether it was so stated or not. I repeat the remark that I made before in a perfectly proper tone. But my Hon. friend, of course, is paroxysmal, as we all know, and sometimes when you scratch the skin of the Russian the Tarter appears. The Hon. gentleman over there (Mr. Davis) made a statement which is incorrect. His statement was that this was the Auditor's statement. Now, I say it is not the Auditor's statement.

Premier Ross :—It was prepared in the Auditor's office.

Mr. Whitney :—To prove conclusively the truth of what I state we have one statement here that is signed by the Auditor, or rather two of them. The statement with regard to annuities, and the statement with regard to receipts and expenditures. These statements are signed by the Auditor; the others are not signed by the Auditor, and one of those that are not signed by the Auditor is the statement which Hon. gentlemen said was made by the Auditor. Now, whether it was made downstairs or upstairs or in my lady's chamber it does not matter. It is whether the statement will have the value of a statement by public officials when it is not.

It Was True.

Mr. Harcourt, (ex-Provincial Treasurer) :—Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat familiar with the contents of this document, and with the method of preparing it. What my Hon. friend, (Mr. Davis) says is true on the face of it, because the information is there, as he says, and, as a matter of fact, the Auditor, and the Auditor only, prepares and has prepared that statement for many years. You will find that, of course, itemized down to a cent in the public accounts which are on the desks of Hon. gentlemen.

Mr. Matheson :—It does not include within half a million of the expenditure, university aid, beet sugar, etc.

Mr. Harcourt :—Well, My Hon. friend is both paroxysmal, cataclysmal and erratic also.

Mr. Matheson :—Please translate those long words.

Mr. Harcourt :—My Hon. friend four long ago learned that we had two kinds of expenditure, and we are the only representative chamber in the world having two kinds of expenditure. One is statutory to which anybody can refer who knows the contents of the statute, which is fixed, and which the Government could not change if it would, which the Auditor in order to place upon the book simply consults the statutes and places it there. Now, Sir, that is statutory. Why should it be there? My Hon. friend refers to railway expenditure. Nothing less than an act of Parliament decides that kind of expenditure and the bill goes through all the stages leading up to it. We all know about that kind of expenditure, and the statutory expenditures are honestly put through, and if my Hon. friend (Mr. Whitney) says that because the Auditor's signature is not at the end of every statement the statement as a whole is not his he states what is not correct.

Mr. Whitney :—It is as clear as mud.

Premier Ross :—A very polite remark.

Mr. Davis :—No doubt after the lucid explanation it is perfectly clear that I am absolutely right in my contention. The Auditor also states another point which I think will be of great satisfaction to this House, and a special satisfaction to citizens of this Province. He tells us that the actual operations of the year 1903 show a surplus of between five and six hundred thousand dollars. There is no dispute, I believe, with reference to that statement, and it is one which will give satisfaction. Then, Sir, in looking forward to year 1904, the Auditor in the statement which he presents to the House and to the country, tells us that, with the present estimates he believes there will be a surplus on the year's transactions of about six hundred thousand dollars. Now, I ask the Hon. gentlemen opposite and the citizens of this Province what better financial position is it possible for the Province of Ontario to be in,