

back to the many interests that can be served and are entitled to consideration if we have the revenues to justify the expenditures. (Applause.) Now then, I say that the hon. gentleman from Kingston, while what he gave was specific enough as to percentages of increase under each head of Government, was not specific in that he did not challenge particular items of expenditure.

### **About Law Costs**

The hon. gentleman just before he closed did refer to the expenditure for law costs. I have a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks before me and I think I am right and fair to the hon. gentleman when I state that nothing said by him throughout his address could be construed into a criticism of any expenditure, except his reference to legal fees or costs paid out and in respect to another small item of expenditure for entertainment. The hon. member for Grenville in replying to the hon. member for Kingston went over these law costs items and showed what these fees were incurred for and showed to the satisfaction of, I fancy, every member of this House that they were quite justified by results. If the hon. member for Kingston had said the Attorney General should look after all law cases, do all this legal work or employ more solicitors under the direct control of the Department to do it there would be something in my hon. friend's criticism. He only says "You have paid out to lawyers a large amount of fees." He does not attempt to say whether paid out for proper purposes or that they are extravagant fees or that the results did not justify the expenditures, and when he stops short of that he does not make any proper criticism.

### **Dr. Jekyll versus Mr. Hyde**

But if I am unable to convince my hon. friend as to what ought to be done, and that a financial critic ought to be specific in his objections and criticisms, I know I can quote to my hon. friend something that will carry conviction, and not only carry conviction to him personally, but will, I am sure, have a great weight with other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. There is in the city of Kingston a paper, "The Kingston Whig," whose editor is the hon. member for Kingston in this House. The editor of the "Whig," in his private capacity as editor, gives the most effective answer that can be given to the argument of the hon. member for Kingston in this House, when he stands up and attempts to criticize the Government because of the increased expenditure. The hon. gentleman, as editor, heads his article in the Kingston Whig, "What is the Kick About?" and then refers to an article in another newspaper