

of water back of the Speaker's chair from the roof. In the Attorney-General's office the roof leaks in several places. How could these structures be otherwise, erected, as they were, some 30 years ago, and built of wood with a brick veneer? It has been said we might go along for years without putting up new buildings. "We do not want to interfere with the Capital in any way." I know that there is no question about moving the Capital. I do not think there would ever be any agreement as to where to bring it, if changed. But it is said you could get on with these buildings for a long time. Well, of course, we could make patch-work of them and spend large sums of money every year in making repairs. From \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year could be expended for that purpose for years to come. A few years ago the repairs and additions amounted to \$20,000, and \$30,000 would be within the mark of what has been spent there during the last four years. At the present time there has to be a carpenter employed on these buildings constantly. No one found fault with the \$75,000 expended last year for the erection of a fire-proof land registry office. Then it has been said that it would be far better to spend this money in opening up roads, streets and bridges. Even if the Government could build roads and take a road to every settler's door, how much dissatisfaction would be caused by those who would not get the roads just where they wanted them? [Applause.] Spend that \$600,000 how you like, you would have just as many dissatisfied persons as you would have satisfied ones. You would have complaints from Cariboo to Comox of favoritism by the Government. Let us consider what this really means, this expenditure: It has been put to you as if it meant \$600,000 thrown down in a lump sum and taken from a depleted treasury. The expenditure means exactly the yearly sum for a sinking fund to pay off the loan and the interest. What does that amount to? I got the auditor to make me a computation of what the sinking fund and interest would amount to.

Financial Condition of the Province.

As you are aware, the financial condition of the Province is excellent. The credit of the Province stands nearly equal to any other colony in the world. (Cheers.) British Columbia's 3 per cents are now quoted at 93 to 93½. Now, at 93, the interest would be £3 4s 6d per cent. In order to realize a sum equal to \$600,000 bonds sold at 93, it would require an issue of about £133,333, and the annual interest thereon would be £3,999, or \$19,384. The cost to the Province on the above basis would be annually, interest \$19,384, sinking fund \$6,000, total \$25,384; and at the end of 50 years it would be paid off. These are not my computations; they were made by the Provincial auditor. Now, I would like to know, if \$25,000 is going to be expended for this purpose every year, how much that sum

distributed over the whole Province is going to shorten the funds available in building roads and making permanent improvements. When you take the \$5,000 for repairs into account, you still have it to reduce the \$25,000 with. Say the yearly expenditure is from \$300,000 to \$500,000 upon roads, streets, bridges and public improvements, I say what figure does the sum of \$20,000 cut in respect of this expenditure? It is not worth mentioning. Victoria and district, in common with the rest of the country, are entitled to their share in the distribution of public moneys, and in apportioning that, this expenditure will of course be taken into consideration. The same may be said in regard to the traffic bridge across the Fraser. So that there is no more injustice in appropriating \$20,000 for the purpose of sinking fund and interest upon the \$600,000 for the buildings, than in appropriating \$15,000 for seven years for the bridge across the Fraser. You will say this is only temporary. That may be, but the member for the district, when the time comes, will, I expect, present a strong case for an increased grant.

Expenditures on the Mainland.

It was said that the Mainland was unjustly dealt with in the matter of public appropriations. I deny that, and shall prove to you that in the matter of appropriations for public works the Mainland has had its full quota of justice. When the delegation came to Victoria in 1890 it was not denied that this was the case. The delegates admitted that this district had been fairly dealt with at that time. Let us look over what has been expended during the last three years on the Mainland and on the Island. You will find that for public purposes, everything outside of the civil government salaries, and the cost of maintaining the Government, there has been spent on Vancouver Island—in 1890, \$173,840; in 1891, \$163,263; and in 1892, \$208,088; or a total of \$545,191. On the Mainland what do we find? In 1890 there was spent \$337,293; in 1891, \$335,462; in 1892, \$433,362; a total of \$1,106,117, or more than double what was spent on Vancouver Island. (A voice, Show the revenue.) Yes, I shall proceed to do so. During that time the revenue derived from the Island, inclusive of land sales, was \$585,542.01, leaving a balance over and above expenditure of \$40,401.01 to go into the general purposes of the Government. Upon the Mainland the total amount of the revenue was very much larger; it was \$1,249,060.19. (Cheers.) Take from that the amount actually expended on the Mainland, and you have a balance of \$142,943.19 returned to the treasury for the purposes of the general government of the country. So that on the Island you have \$40,401.01 returned to the treasury of the revenue of the country, over and above the appropriations; and on the Mainland, \$142,943.19 to the treasury of the revenue of the country. Do these