

coming out and exerting influence against all the Reform candidates in the constituencies through which the line passes? The Superintendent of the Canada Southern Railway on the morning of his election sent a telegram to the employees urging them to go out and do what they could for his opponent. This was explained by the fact that certain materials which had been brought in without paying proper duties were held over the head of the Company, and the officers were thus compelled to support the Conservatives. He thought Mr. Meredith was the wrong man to abuse the Government, and try to influence the independent members against the Government. The Opposition were afraid of the ability which the new Minister of Education would show in the House. He was surprised at the hon. member for South Lanark, who was elected by independent votes, coming before the House and saying that he would vote for the Conservative party. With reference to the speech of the hon. member for North Essex, he (Mr. White) had started out with a tirade against the Red-distribution Bill of 1874, and he (Mr. Balfour) thought that had it not been for this rearrangement he (Mr. White) would never have found a seat in the House. The results of this rearrangement showed that the Government did it honestly, and with good intent. The hon. gentleman had also referred to what was done in Algoma. He (Mr. White) had said he was not aware of what was done as he did not go up. The member for his (Mr. White's) riding in the House of Commons had gone there, and Mr. White could have easily found out what had been done. Regarding the Boundary Award he showed that the position of the Government had been consistent throughout, and stated that surely if Mr. Mackenzie had known the kind of man the Reformers would have had to deal with he would have passed anticipatory legislation. He proceeded to deal with the Dominion grab of the Provincial railway system, and this he regarded as one of the most important questions now before the House. The House had passed legislation with regard to the protection of railway employees, and they would have to ask themselves what the result would be. He read only a short time ago a case reported of a man who had secured a verdict before the County Court which was upset on appeal because of the Dominion Railway Act. He would seriously ask the question, are we to continue paying the grants to the railways if they were taken away from Provincial control? He showed the hollowness of complaints against the license inspectors by quoting Mr. White's platform declaration that they were his friends and he had nothing to say against them. He was at one with the Government in any efforts the Government might make for securing the abolition of the veto power. He proved that 31 only out of 184 students of the Agricultural College were from cities. But even if they were from cities it was an answer to the charge that young men were leaving the farms to go to the cities. In answer to Mr. Lauder's lucubration about sectional appeals he read the Macdonald-Tupper-Foy correspondence, in which Sir John expressed "no confidence in the breed."

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess.

Mr. BALFOUR, on continuing, said the Opposition had generalized a great deal with reference to the expenditure of the Province. He showed that between the years 1867 and 1871 inclusive, the receipts of the Province were \$10,237,000; the expenditure for that time amounted to \$6,659,000, leaving a surplus of \$3,578,000. The Public Accounts from 1872 to the end of 1882 showed that the total receipts of the Province amounted to \$34,735,000, with an expenditure of \$32,758,000, leaving a cash surplus of \$2,007,000. The Opposition had said that they had reduced the cash surplus. The Government did not deny it; but they did deny that the money had been improperly expended. (Hear, hear.) They aided the people by assisting railways, municipalities, and public works. It was a wise policy for the Government to expend the money for the people of the whole Province. (Hear, hear.) They claimed credit that the finances of the Province had been well managed. They had expended \$25,000,000 for the benefit of the people, and had a cash surplus of over \$2,000,000. The Opposition claimed that the expenditure had increased between the years 1871 and 1882. There was a large increase. It must be remembered that there had been a large growth in the Province. It had extended in wealth and population. The improvement of the Province would necessarily cost money. What did they find? The expenditure in 1871 was \$1,816,000; in 1882 it was \$2,427,000, showing an increase of \$601,000. The principal items were, for education \$160,000, maintenance of public institutions \$437,000, and administration of justice \$80,000. It had been a general complaint that the expenditure for civil government had increased. The expenditure for civil government had not increased since 1880. This \$160,000 increase of the Education Department was expended under the head of civil government, when it was formerly placed under the head of education. (Hear, hear.) The increase under legislation was very small. In 1881 and 1882 there was an unusual expenditure for printing. The printing of the Agricultural Commission Reports had been ordered by the House for which the Government could hardly be directly responsible. In 1883 the Government had only asked for \$102,900 to carry on the legislation of the country. He claimed that the Opposition had not pointed out to the Government

where expenditure might be decreased. He also referred to the expenditure for Colonization Roads, which he held was a perfectly proper and just expenditure. In Muskoka the Opposition asserted that Algoma was getting more than its share of the Colonization Roads money, and that if they got office they would deal more fairly with Muskoka. In Algoma the Opposition had taken another course. A prominent member of the Opposition had asserted in a speech at Mantowaning that they would deal more liberally with Algoma than the Reformers had done.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Will the hon. gentleman say when and where I said such a thing? I was not authorized to announce the policy of the Opposition.

Mr. BALFOUR intimated that he had his information from a good source.

A VOICE (in the Speaker's gallery)—I can prove it.

This unexpected sally caused a long laugh, but as the gentleman who came to Mr. Balfour's help did not catch the Speaker's eye he was not ejected from the House.

Mr. BALFOUR, resuming, read the letter containing his information. He gave a scathing rebuke to Mr. White for his refusal to accept the explanation of the Premier on the question of the *Mail's* slander.

Mr. MCGHEE announced himself as having been elected to support the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GILLIES flatly denied the assertion of the *Mail* that he would support the Opposition. He had no reason for departing from the principles which had actuated him all his life. He was one of those who would always support measures which in themselves merited support, and that was the reason he always supported the Reform party, because that party naturally supported a liberal policy. So long as the present Government continues to introduce measures and support the course for the interest of the country, he was prepared to give them his general support. It struck him very forcibly that the submission of the Boundary question to the Privy Council comprised nearly the whole of the demands of this Government from Sir John Macdonald. They had got undisputed control of seven-eighths of the population, and that was as near the whole as could be anticipated. On the question of Provincial rights, he showed that the desire for Provincial rights was an important factor in inducing Ontario to enter Confederation. The abuses of the legislative union with Quebec were such as to incite Ontario to seek Provincial rights through Confederation. Members on the other side had jeered and laughed at the idea of fighting for the rights of this Province; but they must remember that the rights and privileges now held by freemen had been obtained by those who fought for them. He alluded in a humorous manner to Mr. Robillard's address in French, and then proceeded in excellent Gaelic to address the Speaker.

Cries of "Question! question!" here were made, and the first five clauses of the reply to the Speech from the Throne were passed.

Mr. MEREDITH in rising to move an amendment to the sixth paragraph of the Address, said he wished to draw attention to some of the speeches of the hon. members opposite. They had made it a point to attack the Central Government. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had spoken of the "infamous" Gerrymander Bill. He thought there were Reform members at Ottawa who were able to discuss the question face to face with their opponents, but he wished to say something with reference to this bill. He did not say that the Gerrymander Bill of the Dominion Parliament was absolutely free from blame, but he held that the measure would compare with the one passed by the hon. gentlemen opposite. He held that the bill passed at Ottawa was more fair and just than the one passed by the hon. gentlemen opposite. He referred to a number of constituencies which he claimed had been wrongfully divided. He attempted to justify himself from the charge of having supported Mr. Johnson in West Middlesex, by charging that the Commissioner of Crown Lands had been guilty of similar conduct. Alluding to the Barrie episode, as shown up by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, he asserted that no one had any right to saddle upon him a justification of the Dominion Government having taken the control of the liquor traffic. His position as deliberately stated now, was that if it should be determined ultimately that the right existed in the Federal authorities to control the liquor traffic or override the Provincial authorities, that the responsibility would rest upon this Government for the partisan manner in which they had carried out the Act. With regard to the appointment of the division court clerks and bailiffs by the county councils he asserted that the *Mail* had misrepresented him, and confounded what he said with regard to license commissioners with what he said on division court clerks and bailiffs. On the question of Provincial rights he said the Dominion had rights as well as individual powers, and asserted that this Government's policy was one which they condemned in the Dominion. They had proceeded on a policy of centralization and refused to trust the people. He contended that the maintenance of the veto power was necessary to the permanence of the Confederation. In justification of the course of the Dominion Government with regard to the veto power, he said that the Govern-