

the strength of the Treasurer's statement. The Government could afford almost to rest their case upon the Opposition speeches. He was sure the criticisms upon which they had dwelt would not impress the country very much. Mr. Clancy had confessed that his speech was very much a repetition of former statements. Well, as such it had already been reported in previous sessions, and it was a singular confession of weakness that the critics of the Government had to put forward year after year, after they had been again and again refuted, the same arguments. Mr. Clancy had started with a statement that direct taxation was upon us. That was an old story. It was always very prominently put forward on the eve of the election. He did not think people would worry greatly about it. They would hardly regard as indications of direct taxation the plain facts that stared them in the face, that the surplus assets of the Province had increased during 1893 by a quarter of a million dollars, and that the Province had over a million dollars cash on hand at the present moment. These things did not look like direct taxation. Mr. Clancy had dwelt on the increase in civil government, and had argued that the increase was out of proportion to the increase of population. He had quoted the name of Mr. Ross, the late Treasurer, as authority for the statement that an increase in civil government was an indication of extravagance. Mr. Balfour quoted from the budget speech of Mr. Ross in 1894 to show that he had said nothing of the sort, but had plainly stated that an increase in the expenditure on civil government was absolutely necessary as the population increased. He had said the per capita expenditure had increased. He was not fair in this criticism. He had been taking a period of ten years, but in this case, instead of comparing the per capita expenditure of 1883 with that of 1893, he had taken that of 1883 and some intervening year in which the expenditure was large. In this way he had brought the per capita expenditure up to \$1 84, whereas for 1893 the per capita expenditure was only \$1 74. In several other respects Mr. Clancy had not been at all fair in his comparison. He did not give the Government credit for economy in any direction. He talked of direct taxation as staring us in the face on the one hand, and on the other ignored entirely the prospects of decreased expenditure on certain lines. He said nothing whatever of the way in which the Government was reducing its railway and annuity liabilities, which alone would show a tremendous decrease in the course of the next few years. Mr. Clancy did not either take into account the fact that expenditure on account of public buildings would materially decrease from this time forward. It would be \$300,000 less for 1894 than for 1893. There was no evidence of the approach of direct taxation in this. More than this, Mr. Clancy had not been careful to compare all his arguments of this year with those of last year. Last year in his speech he had said, in speaking of the management of the Crown Lands Department, that between 1883 and 1893 the cost of management had increased from \$67,000 to \$131,000, or by 96 per cent., which he styled "a great increase."

Mr. Clancy—Were not those figures right?

Mr. Balfour admitted they were, but asked Mr. Clancy to wait a moment. Continuing, Mr. Balfour said that in his speech on the present occasion Mr. Clancy had referred again to the same subject, but under changed circumstances. He had again quoted the cost of management in 1883 as being \$67,000, and had then quoted that of 1893 as \$97,193, showing, he had said, "the enormous increase" of 45 per cent. So, when the increase was 96 per cent., it was called a "great increase," and when it fell to 45 per cent. his language grew more extreme, and he styled it "an enormous increase." As his case grew worse he became more desperate. The cost had been greatly reduced from last year, and yet he spoke more violently in condemnation of it than he did last year. Another thing. If the year 1873, twenty years ago, were taken, instead of 1883, the figures of the cost of management of the department were seen to be \$110,000. Thus, there was a decrease between 1873 and 1893 of 13 per cent. in the cost of management. He was not able to sustain his case. Mr. Clancy and his leader had dwelt at some length with the timber question. Mr. Clancy had on a former occasion expressed the view that the management of its timber resources by the Local Government could not be compared with the management of the timber resources at the disposal of the Dominion Government.

Mr. Clancy dissented from this.

Mr. Balfour said he had anticipated Mr. Clancy's repudiation, and so had provided himself with a report of the hon. member's speech, delivered some months since in his constituency. The report had appeared in The Chatham Planet.

Mr. Clancy—Before the hon. gentleman reads it I may tell him there is no truth in the report.

Mr. Balfour then read the report of Mr. Clancy's speech as printed in The Chatham Planet, from which it appeared that he had contrasted unfavorably the management of the Provincial timber resources with the "admirable way" in which the Dominion Government treated its timber resources. Mr. Clancy said he thought the hon. gentleman should accept his repudiation of the statement.

Mr. Balfour said of course he must accept such a denial, but added, amid the laughter of the House, that the sentences he had quoted really read so much like what the hon. gentleman might have been expected to say that he might be excused for supposing that the speech was delivered by Mr. Clancy's twin brother, or somebody very like him. However, he was glad to see the hon. gentleman did not approve of the timber policy of the Ottawa Administration.

Hon. Mr. Hardy—He repents.

Turning for a moment to the views on the question expressed by the leader of the Opposition, said Mr. Meredith's position in this respect was queer. He had taken strong ground upon the wasting of timber, and thought that debt should have been curtailed rather than the timber sold. What did they mean? Would they have the timber stand there till it rotted? Would they have the great timber industry, giving work to thousands of men, brought to an end? The platform that the lumbering business should be killed, and the trees allowed to rot, was not one likely to please the country. A fair and reasonable policy, such as that pursued by the Government, was more likely to find favor. Mr. Balfour then turned to the question of surveys, and took up Mr. Meredith's objection to the expenditure of \$39,000 for surveying "townships in the wilderness." His quotations were not fair, for they purported to be reports from the surveyors of the townships, but were from a commission to report upon the national park. The impression would be left by Mr. Meredith's quotation that all the new townships were like the proposed park. But those townships were selected for the park precisely because they were not suited for agriculture. And from those townships there was obtained \$1,483,000 for the timber.

Mr. Clancy—They were laid out in township lots.

Hon. Mr. Hardy—No. In lots of 1,000 acres each.

Mr. Balfour then maintained that the returns obtained from the timber sales would more than pay for the surveying expenses. It costs \$1,600 to survey a township, and when mining locations are taken up the expense of surveys is more than met. Does not the surveying help the miner, and are there not complaints that the Government does not help the mining interests? Mr. Balfour then referred in strong terms to the policy of the Opposition in opposing every measure of the Government, and asked why they should in this case run down these new districts and try to dissuade settlers from going

into them. He cited surveyors' reports to show how valuable many of these lands are for agricultural purposes, and these favorable reports are not exceptional. In the Lake Temiscamingue district there are 1,000 square miles, 90 per cent. of which are good land; in the Rainy River district there is good land; in both these districts the soil is as good as that of Manitoba, and with a better climate. The population in these is steadily increasing. Why do not the Opposition drop their unpatriotic, carping course? Three-fourths of the townships surveyed since Confederation have had either actual settlers or locations made in them. Is not this the time to make surveys, when millions are coming in from the timber on these lands? The lands in much of the older portions of Ontario, even the garden of Ontario, the Counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton, were formerly spoken of in just the same terms as those used of these new lands by the Opposition. Mr. Balfour then touched on the license question, and the contention that the Province robs the municipalities of license moneys due them. Section 92 of the B.N.A. act showed conclusively that the Province has the undoubted right to take all the license fees. But the Province returns a portion of the license fees, and the municipalities receive just as much as ever they did before the Government took charge of the fees. The Agricultural College came next. Mr. Clancy had spent nearly an hour in reviling that institution, and when remonstrated with had replied, "What are we here for?" Why did not the leader of the Opposition restrain his followers from attacking that college, which was intended for the sons of the farmers of the Province, as he so carefully restrained them from attacking Toronto University or Upper Canada College, an institution for the classes,