

gements made under the terms of Union, as rapidly as the means of the country would warrant; but they might have been justified, under the condition of things which then existed, in not carrying them out; because the condition of the finances of the country was not perhaps such as to compel them to do it. But they did go on, and they increased the debt from \$37,000,000 to \$40,000,000 during that period. Now, that itself is an important item, and it cannot be shown that they were compelled to incur it. When the hon. gentleman points out that the expenditure was twenty-three times greater from 1867 to 1873, or from 1878 to 1883, than it was in their time, I do not see how he works it out. But there is one way of solving this question, and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show that I am in error. I assert it as a true test of the comparative extravagance of the two Governments, and the taxation upon the people. I say, as I have said before, that if hon. gentlemen opposite had paid all their expenditure chargeable to consolidated revenue during their term of office, and we had simply collected what was necessary to pay the expenditure, including this year—in which is the largest expenditure we have had, because we will have \$3,750,000, or \$1,250,000 more than usual—the taxation for Customs and Excise, which is the direct and only taxation our people have to pay, has been less per head of the population during our five years than it was during their Administration. I make that statement, and I am prepared to stand by it—that the taxation imposed upon the people from 1873-74 to 1878-79 was as much per head of the population as it has been in our period, though we have expended large sums of money since 1878 upon public works—upon our canals and our railways. It is quite true, we have collected more taxation from the people; but what have we done with it? We have expended \$37,000,000 in public works during that period; yet, while their debt increased by \$37,000,000, ours increased only by \$15,000,000. Under these circumstances, I cannot see why there should be that fear and dread that the hon. gentleman has spoken of among his friends in the West, unless he has engendered it, as some of his friends have stimulated the discontent in Manitoba and the North-West. He calculates that the Estimates for this year are \$32,900,000. They are, but the expenditure will not amount to that; I do not think that the total expenditure of the present year will exceed \$31,300,000 or \$31,400,000; and for the next year it is to be hoped, even with the Estimates which we are yet to bring down, that the expenditure will be even less than that of the present year. Sir, I do not feel that, in incurring the expenditures which the Government of Canada have been incurring during the last two or three years, for the rapid extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for deepening and enlarging of our canals,—about the propriety of which there may perhaps be some doubt—although it gives us one of the largest and best inland navigation systems in the world—and for the development of all our resources—I do not feel that there is any ground for the distrust which the hon. gentleman has spoken of. On the contrary, while it is true that we are incurring larger expenditures, and while Parliament will be asked in a few days to take upon itself an additional burden—and yet not really an additional burden, because it is to relieve the Provinces of an amount of taxation that they would have to pay into their local treasuries—while we are doing all this, we feel, and have a right to feel, that the people of this country will not be discouraged and disheartened as to the future, and will not be dissatisfied with the course that the Government have been and are pursuing for the development of the country; but, on the contrary, will feel that life is short, and that if we are to have any benefit from these expenditures, we are not to wait for a century or a quarter of a century for them, but that we and our children

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

should derive some of the advantages from these expenditures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to detain the House any longer than I can help; but it is a matter of regret to me, and I think it ought to be a matter of regret even to the hon. Minister himself, that it has been found necessary to defer the consideration of Supplementary Estimates of such magnitude to so very late a period in the Session. It is little less than a public scandal that we should be called upon at this time to deal with questions involving the addition of \$1,000,000 to the expenditure of 1883-84, and with other questions involving the addition of many millions to the public debt. Why, we have not even all the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1884-85 before us.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We did not force this question now upon the hon. member.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but I say it is a very bad practice indeed, for which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are responsible, that they wait until the Session is within the very last days, when they know that every hon. gentleman here is impatient of discussion and so anxious to get home, that they could hardly listen even to the temperate and admirably reasoned speech of my hon. friend beside me in patience. That is the time that the hon. gentleman and his friends choose to submit to us questions of the very first magnitude, involving the imposition of additional burdens of millions upon the people; and I repeat my statement, that it is not creditable to the management of public affairs in this country that year after year—because this is far from being the first time—the Budget debate goes on without the House having before it one half the information it ought to have to enable it to form an honest judgment upon the propositions of the Government. I say this is not the first time. Ten or twelve years before, under somewhat similar circumstances, when there was another Canadian Pacific Railway on the tapis, we had the hon. gentleman bringing down estimates which were found to be utterly inadequate to the wants of the year. Why, Sir, I found, when I succeeded that hon. gentleman, that he had made no provision in his original Budget for about \$3,000,000 a year, which he had added to the public expenditure; and but for the increased taxation which we were compelled to impose, there would have been in 1873-74 and in 1874-75 very large deficits which were averted by that taxation. Now, the hon. gentleman complained that my hon. friend beside me compared our position with that of the United States, unfairly, as he said. Sir, it is quite true that in making a comparison with the United States, the Minister, on the one hand, is justified in taking credit for the subsidies which we pay to the Provinces; but my hon. friend was equally justified in deducting from the expenditures of the United States, at the very least, the enormous sum they pay in pensions, incurred during the late war. I say nothing of the expenditures on account of the army and navy, which are expenses incidental to the position of an independent nation. But let me call attention to this—that if you offset the subsidies on the one hand, and the pensions on the other, the comparison will be greatly more to the advantage of the United States, because they pay \$66,000,000 in pensions, while we pay \$3,500,000 in subsidies; so that, although their population is thirteen-fold or thereabouts that of ours, still the amount of their pensions is much larger relatively than the amount of our subsidies; and therefore my hon. friend was quite correct in calling attention to the unfavourable condition of things which now exists as between ourselves and the United States, but which did not always exist. The hon. gentleman also spoke of a fact which is partly true, that in the United States there are very heavy municipal and state taxes.