including their Estimates for 1883-84, what do we find? When they came into office the controllable expenditure was \$6,941,577; they ask us this year to give them \$10,073,015; in other words, in their five years, instead of decreasing it, as the Mackenzie Administration did nearly Administration did \$1,500,000, they have increased it \$3,131,438. There, Sir, is a plain financial statement of figures that no man who is desirous of discussing the question can get behind, for they stand for com-parison by the people of this country and the hon. members of this House to look into for themselves, and to judge with reference to the protestations of economical management on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. If we were to look into them in detail what would we find? We would find that in all the departments of the Government there is a very greatly increased expenditure. Take the item of Civil Government. In the year 1878-79—for I take the year 1879, though the Mackenzie Administration were in power but a part of that year; but I desire to take all the hon. gentleman can fairly charge upon them—\$861,170 sufficed for the purpose of Civil Government. This year we are asked to give the hon. gentlemen opposite \$1,109,100 for the same purpose, or an increase of \$247,930. When we were in power the hon. gentlemen opposite were fond of charging us with employing a larger staff of men than was requisite, but they have increased it to a wonderful extent. Then 302 men, at a cost of \$343,510, sufficed to run all the Departments. Now they come down, and, by their Estimates, ask to employ 499 men at a cost of \$538,989; they ask us to give them 197 more servants in the different Departments than the Mackenzie Administration had, at an increased cost of \$195,479. They ask us to increase the staff 65 per cent., and the pay 57 per cent. Thus we have some idea of how matters go. If we were to take a peep into contingencies of Civil Government, into the little odds and ends jotted down for this and that purpose, we would find that extravagance has run riot in the Departments in regard to contingent expenses. Little expenses are jotted down under convenient heads, but they are specified sometimes, and we are able to form a judgment respecting them. In looking into contingencies I find hon. Ministers, now occupying the Treasury benches, spending thousands of dollars for travelling expenses, where hundreds sufficed under the Mackenzie Administration. I find considerable sums set down in items of that kind; and if I were to go through the various Departments and specify items, hon members would be inclined to laugh and wonder whether some of the items charged were really correct or not. I find an increase in the Militia Department \$1,106 in contingencies alone. I find placed down for cab hire alone, \$550. I am not objecting to the hon. Minister of Militia engaging a cab once in a while, or even oftener; but I do object to the demoralizing effect of the hon. Minister of Militia—a man who should be trained to war-riding about in a cushioned carriage. I would recommend, not with the view oftaking away from the ease which I desire the hon. gentleman to enjoy, but, in order that there may be no demoralizing influence on the force, that he should put down instead of "cab hire," "war steeds," so that the Militia might think that the hon. Minister was engaged in practising with his war charger, in order the more effectually to show an example of bravery and effi ciency to the troops under him. Let me now come down to the Secretary of States' Department, which shows an increase of \$924. The item of cab hire figures there to the extent of \$331. And so we might go on through the Department of the Interior, which, however, I will not touch upon, because, no doubt, the hon. First Minister, having had his attention called to the matter, will see that economy is practised in the future, as he was careful to press upon my friend the member for East York when he occupied the position of Head of a Department. And so we might go Mounted Police, if required in order to preserve the peace Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

through the Department of Public Works, where a certain Mr. Mackay is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report as having been paid \$1,109, the Auditor General remarking that he had not been able to get an exact copy of the account and full details. Thus we find, all through the Departments, increase of staff, increase of cost, increase in contingent expenses; and the Government are running the mad race they ran when in power before, and are expending, I repeat, thousands, where hundreds served for the same purpose when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. We next come to the question of Immigration and Quarantine. \$212,224 answered for that service during the Mackenzie Administration, while hon gentlemen opposite are asking this year for the like purpose, \$570,487, or, in addition to what was expended at that time, \$358,263, an increase of expenditure under that head amounting to nearly 150 per cent. We are entitled to some explanation in regard to this increase, and the House did not receive it from the hon. Finance Minister. Hon. members who were in this House at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway bargain was submitted, will remember how the hon. the First Minister insisted that the bargain should be completed soon, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were then about initiating an extensive system of immigration in concert with the Dominion Government; and it was of the utmost necessity that the bargain should be consummated quickly, in order that they might be enabled to go over to the Old Country and perfect a system of immigration, and let this country have the benefit of it. That bargain was consummated. I think the terms were extravagant, that the company obtained terms altogether too liberal from the people of this Dominion. But what have they done with respect to this matter of immigration? How comes it that we are asked to devote \$358,263 more to promote immigration than before this company was formed, when we were told expressly that one of the great benefits conferred by the company was to be that they would reduce the cost of immigration, they acting as immigration agents in bringing men here. I have not seen the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I therefore make this remark subject to correction, but I have been informed that in the report of that company there does not appear the expenditure of a single dollar for immigration purposes. And yet the Government of Canada proposes to expend 150 per cent. more for immigration purposes than it did before that company was formed. For whose benefit? If the lands in the North-West had been ours, if colonization companies had not been so largely increased, and if the lands had not been locked up in the hands of those companies, and the railway company, then I could understand that we might derive some benefit from that expenditure; but the land being tied up in every shape and form, I fear the money voted for the purpose will be used far more for the purpose of enhancing and benefiting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than for benefiting the country whose money is being used for that purpose. We pass on to consider the question of Pensions and Superannuations. \$221,326 answered for that service under the late Government, but \$293,385 are now asked for, being an increase of \$72,059. Public Works were managed for \$1,013,593, but \$2,447,940 are asked, being an increase of \$1,454,347. Under the head of Miscellaneous, \$101,602 proved sufficient in 1875, but we are now asked to vote \$194,950. Indian grants involved an expenditure of \$489,327 in 1879, we are now asked to vote \$875,949. Here I must say that the remarks of the hon. the Finance Minister in regard to that point carried a good deal of weight. If this money is required to be expended on the Indians, fault cannot fairly be found with the Government in adopting the plan of conciliating the Indians. The expenditure for Mounted Police has increased from \$344,823 to \$416,000, being an increase of \$71,177. This outlay for the