

Government could object to. The debate was continued by Mr. Wylie, Mr. G. B. Smith, Mr. Marter and Mr. Davis. Of the two Opposition members, Messrs. Wylie and Marter, the latter made decidedly the best impression. He is a fluent speaker and has an air of calmness and fairness which, while it cannot cloak such partisanship as he feels from the old campaign-ers who form the bulk of the membership of the House, must be very effective on the stump. The two Yorks, East and North, represented in the debate came out strong. Mr. Smith found even less ground to go over than Mr. Tait. He spoke briefly, therefore, but when he had finished there was nothing that had been advanced on the other side left unanswered. Mr. Davis astonished even his friends by the forcible character of his address. He did not confine himself to making such a speech as would merely round off the debate, but he dealt with the political condition of the Province on broad grounds, and gave ample reason for his consistent and loyal support of the Administration. Though he spoke late in the evening and when the members might have been expected to be impatient of further debate, he was listened to throughout with the keenest attention and was frequently applauded. The matter of his speech, though dealing with oft-discussed questions, had the force of original thought and original research. The arguments were arranged in logical order and marshalled in overwhelming array against every point to which the orator directed his attack. Mr. Davis' manner of delivery is that of the practised platform speaker gifted with the good sense and good taste to adapt himself readily to the conditions of Parliamentary oratory. The speech was one of the feature of the debate and Mr. Davis has been deservedly complimented upon it both by friends and by opponents. The adjournment of the debate was moved by Mr. Sol. White of Essex, by whom it was resumed to-day.

The order paper shows that the House has had sixteen days of actual sitting. There are now on the paper, as stated, two Government bills awaiting third reading, one at the committee stage and fourteen marked for the second reading. Of these only three are not printed. These measures include all the educational consolidations and amendments promised by the Minister of Education for this session, which taken altogether are not exceeded in interest by any other measures the Government is to present this year. Notice has been given by the Commissioner of Crown Land of his bills to amend the General Mining Act and the Mining Claims Act, very important measures in view of the great interest now centred upon the development of the mining industry of the Province. The Attorney-General also has a number of well-considered bills calculated to facilitate the administration of justice and otherwise improve the statutes of the Province in important respects. Private members have 26 bills on the order paper exclusive of the private bills which (at the second reading stage) number seven. All the public measures have been printed, preparatory to their coming up for second reading, so that there need be no delay in dealing with them. There has been some delay in respect of private bills by reason of the illness of the chairman of the Private Bills Committee, Hon. J. M. Gibson, but time will be made up by frequent sittings, in fact already rapid steps have been made in overtaking the work. There are only thirteen motions for papers, etc., to be discussed, and of these few are likely to give rise to long debate.

The preliminary work of the session is finished and there seems to be a general and commendable desire to finish up the business at the earliest date possible. Judging from present appearances, there is no reason why the House should be detained in session after the end of May.

The House was a little late in opening to-day, but good progress was made during the afternoon and the House adjourned early.

The Journals.

Immediately on opening, before even the formal business of presenting petitions was entered upon, Mr. Fraser, rising to a question of privilege, called the attention of the Speaker, who is responsible for the keeping of the journals of the House, to what he deemed an inaccuracy in those records. The point to which he objected was the printing of four reports of the Committee on Standing Orders, presented on Thursday last, as if they were one report, so that if a member desired to take exception to one of them there was no means of identifying it. Mr. Fraser did not say that any actual difficulty had arisen from the present system, but unless there is some way of explaining it (and no explanation was given) it is easy to see that grave difficulty might arise. The position is this:—The Committee on Standing Orders reviews private bills before their presentation so as to see that the rules respecting public notice, etc., have been complied with. Where the rules have been followed the fact is stated, and the report goes through as a matter of course. But where the rules have not been followed a special report is made upon each bill stating the facts and recommending either that the informality be overlooked or that the bill be not considered. Mr. Fraser's contention was that, as recorded, there was no opportunity for a member to take formal exception to the report of the committee. In his speech Mr. Fraser explicitly stated that the present system had been in vogue for

years, but he contended, not the less, that there should be a change. When Mr. H. E. Clarke asked why the matter was brought to the attention of the House instead of to the attention of the clerk, Mr. Fraser's reply was that he had already spoken about the matter several times, and as no change had been made he had no recourse save to speak of it in his place. Nothing was done in the matter and the House went on with the receiving of petitions. Following the petitions were a number of bills, mainly relating to railway, municipal and other corporations.

The Budget.

Mr. Sol. White resumed the debate on the budget, beginning his speech at ten minutes to 4 o'clock. The places of a considerable number of members were vacated soon after the hon. member for North Essex began his exordium and other hon. members began industriously to write letters.



He first essayed to show that because of extravagance the Government had been unable to keep the expenditures of the year within the income of the Province—although the receipts had been larger than had been estimated. He contended that the affairs of the Province could be conducted within its revenues and that there was no need for the Treasury to continue running behind. He made an attack on the Administration on the ground that money had been expended beyond the appropriation. It mattered little, he said, whether the amount was great or small, it was the violation of a principle to which he called attention; it was illegal, the expenditure of money without the consent of the House. On the question of the expenditure of money on education he held that the Province was going beyond what a State may be rightly called upon to do. It was going too far for the State to undertake education in higher branches and classics. All that the State might be looked to to do was the placing within the reach of every child a good Public School education. With reference to the temperance question he said that claims made for the Government were unfounded; the Local Option Law, of which so much was being made to delude temperance people, really did nothing but remove the obstructions in the way of local prohibition, which the House itself had set in the way since Confederation. The surplus which takes necessarily so prominent a place in the budget speech of the Treasurer is the target of most of the Opposition marksmen, and the hon. member for North Essex did not omit ringing the changes upon it. He followed the example of Mr. H. E. Clarke in declaring the surplus to be made up of assets. In his opinion the railway certificates and annuities which the Treasurer in his speech had not classed as immediate liabilities were in fact of the nature of promissory notes and should, therefore, be deducted from the amount claimed as a surplus. Mr. White concluded his speech after having been talking half an hour.

Mr. Balfour's Address.

There was a rattling round of applause from the Ministerial side when Mr. Balfour of South Essex rose to reply to the member for North



Essex. He struck into the discussion with the vigor and dash that makes him a Rupert of debate. It was the custom of the honorable members opposite, he said, to devote much time to the "mythical surplus," as they termed it. He referred them to the public accounts of the Dominion. There they would find a liability to the Province of Ontario of \$4,827,640 acknowledged. The amount claimed by the Provincial Treasurer was only \$118,000 more than the amount acknowledged by the Dominion Government. Some members even questioned the liability of the Dominion to the Province, and to answer them he read a letter from Mr. Courteney, Deputy Finance Minister of the Dominion, in which he declared that for the amount of the \$4,827,640 the Dominion acted merely as the trustee to invest and pay out to the Province the interest thereon. Mr. Balfour went on to show that it would be quite a reasonable thing to count in the assets the value of the present Parliament buildings and grounds. Respecting the relation of the Crown lands to the surplus he quoted the statement of Mr. H. E. Clarke that the timber was a good asset, and showed that at the estimated value of that asset it might be sold at the rate now current, and yet the timber would last for over a century. (Cheers.) On the same basis, not only the forests but the minerals and lands owned by the Province might be counted as an asset, and he believed they were value to-day for two hundred millions of dollars. The member for South Essex then took up the rather tangled criticisms by Mr. H. E. Clarke with regard to the subsidies and the opinions set forth by the Inter-Provincial Conference, and he placed the matter so clearly and plainly that it is hardly

conceivable that answer or criticism will be even attempted. He showed that the Liberals in this House had recorded their votes in formal protest against the changes made in the financial basis of Confederation by mere action of the Dominion Parliament, and further that the action of the Inter-Provincial Conference was strictly consistent with this in demanding that the financial basis should be made first and then fixed by Imperial statute so that it could not be changed as at present merely for the purpose of securing to the Government the support of particular Provinces. Mr. Clarke, according to the reports of friendly newspapers, remonstrated with the Liberals in the House for abusing the man who gave the Province its subsidy, presumably the Finance Minister of the Dominion. Mr. Balfour reminded the chief financial critic of the Opposition that the Finance Minister did not pay this money out of his private purse, and that a certain British North America Act set forth the arrangement under which this portion of the taxes they paid to the Dominion was returned to the people of Ontario. Respecting the license question Mr. Balfour was able to show that in one part of his speech Mr. Clarke represented the Government as a knot of tyrants keeping the liquor traffic under despotic rule, and a little later declared that it was impossible to say whether the Government controlled the liquor traffic or the liquor traffic controlled the Government. As to the plea that the Government should return to the municipalities all the money taken in liquor license fees, he showed that constitutionally the Government had as good a right to raise revenue in this way as the municipalities had, and that from the point of view of expediency the raising of a revenue was quite justifiable by a Government that returned so much to the municipalities as did the present Administration. He put in contrast these figures:—

Taken in license fees by the Province	\$ 3,000,000
Returned to municipalities in maintenance of public institutions, gaols, etc.....	21,000,000

He drew a parallel between the remarks of Mr. White and Mr. Clarke, one declaring that to the United States Canadians must look for a market for minerals, and from the United States must they expect the enterprise and capital to develop the mines, while Mr. Clarke declared that the policy of the Government was "educating citizens for a foreign State," that "there is not room in Canada for all the professionals we are turning out," this being a "sparsely settled country." "Shade of the N.P.!" remarked Mr. Balfour amidst applause, "where were you when that sentiment was uttered?" He said he was not surprised at the remarks made by Mr. White, he being a propagandist of annexation, but to hear such remarks from the loyal senior member from Toronto was strange indeed. Mr. Balfour had some fun with Mr. Clarke over the election figures, by which that gentleman proved to the satisfaction of such of his friends as have been content to take the result without examining the calculation that the Government is in a minority in the country. He showed how Mr. Clarke adopted a variety of contradictory principles, the result in each case being against the Government, and, taking the rule he himself laid down in the majority of cases, proved that there was a popular majority for the Government of over 10,000. The speaker followed Mr. Marter through some of the financial mazes trod by that gentleman, and, by admitting frankly that the Government had spent a part of the surplus piled up by John Sandfield Macdonald, deprived the member for Muskoka of his principal argument. The Opposition have renewed their charges that supplies for the public institutions are bought of Government favorites and without tender, but up to this time they have not given any proof of their assertions. Mr. Balfour quoted the report of the Public Accounts Committee last session as adopted by the House, declaring that the principle of public tender was adopted wherever possible. Mr. Clancy interrupted to ask who had voted for this report, and when told that it was adopted by majority vote of the committee he answered, "Aha!" as if no further answer were needed. Mr. Balfour reminded him that if the Opposition members had voted against it in committee or in the House they had done so without being able to give a single fact in support of their contention, although they had the whole civil service at their disposal from whom to get evidence under oath before the Public Accounts Committee. The habit of Opposition speakers, latest exemplified by Mr. White, of charging the whole expenditure made in a year against the revenues of the year, was dealt with briefly, and it was shown that neither in the Dominion nor in any other Province was such a principle recognised, there being some expenditures charged against capital. In conclusion, Mr. Balfour pointed out in forcible style that no definite charge of corruption or even of extravagance was made against the Government, and that the only policy which could be inferred from the speeches of the Opposition was to deprive the Province of revenue from the Dominion subsidy and the liquor licenses and resort to direct taxation.

Mr. McCleary Speaks.

Mr. McCleary was the next speaker, and the Legislature heard him for the first time. He made an excellent impression. He spoke long