

Fund," and not out of the public Treasury at all. Hence the term "special account," and the absurdity of charging the amount to the current expenditure of the year.

The term "special account" is applied to the expenditure on the School of Practical Science.

For the purposes of a College of Technology, the Government of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, unwisely, as it turned out, purchased the building of the Toronto Mechanics' Institute. It proved most unsuitable and was re-sold by the present Government to its original proprietors, the proceeds in money being applied to the erection of a suitable building near the University. The money thus expended forms a "special account," and is no part of the ordinary expenditure.

The sum of \$67,830 for Common Gaol alterations, was, in effect, a grant to the Municipalities interested, to repay their outlay on those edifices. It was properly a charge against surplus, and so appears in the official return, signed by the auditor, from which the above figures are taken.

The trifling deficit in 1878 was owing solely to the great falling off in Woods and Forests revenue, consequent upon the depression of the timber trade. As a proof of the wholly exceptional state of things, it may be mentioned, that the revenue, in 1878, was \$80,000 less than that of 1871, the year of the lowest revenue (except 1878) since Confederation.

The inclusion of the investments of the public money in drainage debentures, among current expenditure, is so impudent an attempt to mislead, that no further proof or argument is required to discredit the person guilty of it.

His Conclusions versus Facts.

Assuming Senator Macpherson's figures to be, according to his method of reckoning, correct, the case stands thus:—

Senator Macpherson on the five years endeavours to make out an aggregate deficit of \$2,704,098
Instead of a SURPLUS as shewn by an honest and rational statement, taking the same figures, of \$2,594,416

Five Years' Finance from Official Returns.

The following is the exact result of the financial operations of the five years in question, taken from a return presented to the Legislature last Session, and signed by the auditor:—

1874—Revenue.....	\$3,446,348	
Expenditure under Supply Bill...	2,342,339	\$1,104,009
1875—Revenue.....	\$3,156,605	
Expenditure under the Supply Bill	2,063,550	\$1,093,055
1876—Revenue.....	\$2,589,222	
Expenditure under the Supply Bill	2,155,185	\$434,037

1877—Revenue	\$3,227,699	
Expenditure under the Supply Bill	2,363,806	\$863,893
1878—Revenue	\$2,308,925	
Expenditure under the Supply Bill	2,408,534	
Deposit.....	99,609	
Aggregate surplus.....	\$2,494,694	
Less deficit in 1878.....	99,609	3,395,385

But, the sum of \$748,853 must also be deducted, as it represents money temporarily borrowed only, and is not, therefore, a portion of revenue.

Aggregate surpluses	\$3,395,385
Less	740,853

Net SURPLUS on the five years over and above the Expenditure under the Supply Bill.... \$2,646,532

So that, instead of being "APPALLED" by the spectacle conjured up by Senator Macpherson, of annual deficits amounting in five years to \$2,704,098, the people of Ontario can contemplate with satisfaction an actual accrual of surplus of no less than \$2,646,532, applicable to the policy of distributing the surplus funds of the Province among those to whom they of right belong; a policy partially acted on by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald in 1871; expanded by Mr. Blake in 1872; still further elaborated by Mr. Mowat in 1873; emphatically approved and endorsed by the electors in 1875; never challenged by a responsible representative of any party; and, for the first time, made the subject of unprincipled or crazy misrepresentation by the "great purifier of Canadian public life" Senator D. L. Macpherson.

Before noticing some of the Senator's pretended criticisms of the public expenditure, a few other of his charges may be disposed of:—

The Cap on the Wrong Head.

The Senator, at p. 7 of his letter, says:—"Their Anti-dual representation Act, restricting the choice of the people, was strangely inconsistent with the principles professed by Reformers. It was probably passed at the instance of Mr. Brown, who could foresee that its tendency would be to exclude men of ability from the Local Legislature, and to make that body more subservient to him."—*Letter*, p. 7.

The Act which first touched the question of dual representation was passed by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald. In the Independence of Parliament Act, Ontario, 32 Victoria, cap. 4, sec. 2, it is enacted: "No Senator or Privy Councillor of the Dominion of Canada shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly, nor shall he sit or vote in the same."

And in the 8th section of the same Act it is provided: "If any member of the Executive Council of Ontario shall,