

DEFICIT DOUBLE AMOUNT STATED, DECLARES CRITIC

**"Extravagant" Farmer-ways
Subject of Severe
Attacks**

BROKERS ARE FATTENING

**Provincial Bonds Bought as
Low as 95 Soar
to Par**

An actual deficit of \$1,700,000, more than double that reported to the Legislature by Provincial Treasurer Smith, was what Charles McCrea, Conservative member for Sudbury, professed yesterday to have found in the mass of statistics tabled Tuesday by Hon. Mr. Smith. Mr. McCrea said the Provincial Treasurer had wrongly charged hundreds of thousands of dollars to capital expenditure.

Both Mr. McCrea and W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal, South Ontario, who preceded him, pointed out to the Government the need for curtailing expenditures somewhere. Mr. McCrea said he believed that the Government was heading toward an expenditure of from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000 in 1921. The member for South Ontario twitted the Government supporters across the House on the fact that only six out of 254 bills introduced last session related to agriculture.

Mr. Sinclair's Criticism.

Resuming his criticism of the Budget, Mr. W. E. N. Sinclair of South Ontario, Liberal, stated that in his opinion the Attorney-General should not have expended public money in the defense of a certain civil action that had arisen in his administration of the O.T.A.

Regarding flotations of loans, the Liberal critic drew the attention of the House to the low rates at which the bonds had been sold and reiterated his opinion of Tuesday that the bonds should have been disposed of by public tender. The Provincial bonds, he continued, immediately they were in the hands of the brokers, had appreciated in value very materially; bonds that brought as low as 95, or less, when disposed of were now selling at par.

"I want to touch the pet subject of agriculture," went on Mr. Sinclair. There had been, he said, only six bills last session dealing with the agricultural industry. Apparently the Farmer members had not made use of their privilege of putting bills through the House.

Hon. Mr. Raney—Does the honorable gentleman therefore exonerate the Farmers from the charge of class Government?

Why They Leave Farms.

The increase in the urban population of Ontario was not due to decrease in the population of rural areas, was the contention of the member for South Ontario. Rural depopulation, he said, was due in no small part to the wider use of labor-saving machinery, and was not reflected in rural decay such as had been painted by some speakers. Emigration to Western Canada, a declining birth-rate, and desire on the part of farm children for higher education, all had played a part in drawing people from the farms of the Province.

"I do not see how any industry under the sun could stand the amount of knocking that is done,