

more of the expenditure for 1878-9 than we ourselves had brought down Estimates or taken Orders in Council for. I may likewise point out the very important differences in our respective treatment of the situation. In 1873 I found, as I showed in the clearest possible manner, that, unless large additional taxes were put on, there was a certainty of a very serious deficit occurring, and we put on taxes which, as everybody admitted, cured the deficit for that year and the next year, without inflicting any serious burden on the people of the country. I say that, when no more than 2 or 3 per cent. are added it matters little whether the revenue be anticipated by a few months or weeks; but it matters a great deal when, as in the case of this Tariff, the Tariff was raised at one bound from 17 to 35 per cent. in the case of many articles of general consumption. I notice that in these allusions to deficits, the hon. gentleman was cautious enough to adopt a somewhat different tone from that which he and his colleagues indulged in in other places as to what these deficits portend. Perhaps the shadow of coming events may have been on the hon. gentleman. He may have in view a time when it would not be convenient for him to lay down the general proposition that deficits cannot exist without proving the great imbecility, the great incapacity for administration, of the Government who are responsible for them. Perhaps, Sir, there was another reason. Our position at present, as regards that hon. gentleman, is peculiar. I do not remember, to have found in constitutional history anything at all resembling it in time past. We have here on the floor of this House a Finance Minister duly authenticated and holding Her Majesty's commission. But, if rumour is to be believed, there is behind that hon. gentleman a very distinguished personage, who is a sort of *alter ego* to the Minister of Finance, who is here, there and everywhere, as the necessities of the Finance Minister compel him. Does the Finance Minister go to London to negotiate a loan; that distinguished personage is there. Is he called upon to explain the fiscal policy of his country before a Chamber of Commerce in England; that distinguished person is there. Does he go to Washington; that distinguished per-

sonage is there. I am glad the hon. gentleman is in such good hands. I have a great admiration and respect for that distinguished personage, and I do not know that I ever felt more admiration for him than when I saw him discharging the whole duty of an ambassador abroad as those duties are defined by those two eminent constitutional authorities, Sir Henry Wotton and the present Minister of the Interior, with such a splendid disregard to the consequence to his own reputation provided only he could assist the Minister of Finance in his difficulties. I can understand that that distinguished gentleman at any rate, if he has not forgotten all he ever did or said or suffered, would have given a wise word of caution to the present Minister of Finance. I cannot doubt that a man of his experience in public affairs must be aware that there is considerable danger, in spite of all the hon. gentleman's calculations, that things may not turn out precisely as he expects; that this year and next year, and possibly the next two years, he may expect serious deficits. Perhaps, too, the hon. gentleman remembers, and I dare say the hon. gentleman's colleague remembers, a certain episode which I must apologise for troubling the House with, though it has a decided bearing on the question before us. I can recollect very well a period at which the present First Minister directed the affairs of this country, a period at which the distinguished person to whom I have alluded was his Minister of Finance. I can recollect in 1858, when the revenue of Old Canada was \$5,270,000, and when there was a net deficit, deducting the sinking fund, of \$3,083,000, or a percentage of deficit to revenue of 58 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. In 1859 there was a revenue of \$6,600,000 and a net deficit of \$1,328,000, or a ratio of deficit to revenue of about 20 per cent. The succeeding year there was a deficit of \$1,939,000 to a revenue of \$7,500,000, or a proportion of 26 per cent. In 1861 there was a revenue of \$7,500,000, with a deficit of \$1,879,000, being in the proportion of 25 per cent. to the revenue. Now, Sir, in our time, there was a deficit in 1876. The revenue in that year was \$22,500,000, and the net deficit, deducting sinking fund, was \$1,077,000, being in the proportion of four and four-fifths of