

year, is perhaps in point of actual value worth about as much as the entire Dominion. I have no doubt they could afford as well to pay as large a salary for their Governor as the Dominion could to ours. They pay him \$10,000 a year, while Ontario pays our Lieutenant Governor, appointed by the Crown—for he is not required to seek the popular vote, he is not required to cultivate popularity—he gets the appointment from the Crown and draws \$10,000, along with perquisites and other expenses connected with his position. I find that in the Province of Quebec the same amount is paid to their Lieutenant-Governor. Now, Sir, I believe it is only by the reduction of those amounts that we can possibly hope to bring the amount of taxation levied on the people of this Dominion within proper limits. I say that it is time that we should commence seriously to consider several items of expenditure, from the largest to the smallest, cut them down in every single instance and bring them within the means of the people of this Dominion. We have been going on in an extravagant way year after year, and every year the amount is increasing. The incidental expenses are annually increasing. I find that in the several Departments in this city, for the convenience of hon. gentlemen and their attendants and clerks in these Departments, there is no less a sum paid, according to the Auditor General's Report of last year, \$9,660.25 for newspapers and periodicals, not for advertising, or for any work done, but actually for periodicals and newspapers supplied to the Departments. I find in looking over the items of incidental expenses connected with the several Departments presided over by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have spent in the matter of incidental expenses, \$177,945.56. Out of this there has been paid \$22,346.79 for expenses connected with His Excellency the Governor General and members of the Government—travelling expenses of the Governor General and suite, and members of the Government. Included in that amount I find that members of the Government, for their own personal expenses and cab hire in the city of Ottawa, have actually drawn from the Treasury \$6,280.18, that they have actually drawn from the treasury \$6,280.18, over and above their salaries of \$7,000 or \$9,000 a year, their annual sessional allowance of \$1,000 a year, and also their allowance for mileage, if they come from a distance to attend to their duties here. I think, when the people of this country come to understand these expenditures, they will not endorse them. I think, when they come to understand that money is thrown away in this kind of style, that they will rise in their might, and will pledge every man who comes to Parliament not to support any Government, Reform or Conservative, that spends the public money in this way. I say it is time we had an end to this sort of thing; it has gone too far; and I hope the day is not far distant when men will be sent here to watch the public accounts and criticise every item, in the interests of their constituents, and see that the public money, is not squandered and frittered away in this kind of style. Now, I have no doubt that any hon. gentleman who follows me will rise up and say that we are still decrying our country. Well, all I have got to say is this: Hon. gentlemen opposite place us in the position that we must tell the truth; and if they like to take the alternative of telling the opposite, and not decrying the country, we are willing that they should assume that responsibility. It is our duty to criticise the policy of the Government, every item of expenditure, and every matter of interest to our country, and in doing that, if we should expose some matters which are not perhaps too creditable to us, it is only because we feel it to be our duty, in the interest of our country, in the interest of the people who have sent us here, to tell the truth and the whole truth, and to expose those things that should be exposed. There was another matter that I should have referred to, in connection with the items of expenditure. A

few evenings ago we had a considerable discussion with regard to extra fees paid to clerks engaged in the several Departments here. On looking over the accounts, I find that there is one continuous systematic effort to fleece the public chest by every man engaged in the Departments here. Every man engaged in any of the Departments, if he does an extra hour's, or half hour's work, makes a demand for extra pay, and the members of the Government are apparently only too willing to allow it. In connection with the Savings Bank Branch of the Post Office Department I find that \$1,927.67 was allowed for counting interest on deposits—paid extra to men who receive a salary, year by year, for doing work of this kind; men who receive full and ample allowance for the work they perform; men who only put in a few hours a day, and have the balance for themselves; simply because it becomes necessary for them to make these little calculations, they make a demand and are paid this amount in excess of the sums they receive for their ordinary employment. Now, I say it is wrong that these things should be permitted, and it is the duty of every man in this House to expose them; and if his remonstrances are not listened to by the Government, it is his duty to carry these things to the constituencies and press upon the people the necessity of pledging those who are sent here to see that the annual expenditure is cut down to the limit of the people's means, and to the point that will enable the people to live easily. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have been always willing and anxious to criticise us as free traders. Well, I have only to say that however anxious any man on this side of the House might be to see a system of free trade introduced, hon. gentlemen opposite have placed it out of the power of the most ardent free trader in this country to realise free trade in the present generation. The way our annual debt is rolling up places an insuperable barrier in the way of free trade. It is quite evident that we must have either a revenue or a protective tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed, for the time being, to insist on a protective tariff—first, in the interests of the manufacturing institutions, and secondly, in order to meet the demands on the Treasury. We on this side claim that a revenue tariff is the true basis of taxation. We claim that people should not be called on to contribute more than the necessities of the public expenditure require. We say that any more is unfair, and unjust, and unwise. Now, I have endeavored to put my remarks in as concise a form as possible. I thank this House for listening to me in my rambling remarks, and I hope that by these discussions and criticisms of the public affairs of this country, we shall be guided in coming to conclusions that will be for the best interests of the people of this country, and will tend to build it up and make it what we should be glad to see it become a great and prosperous nation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time to address this hon. House, and at so late a stage of this important debate, the main subjects of which have already been so fully and ably discussed by hon. members, I am impressed, Sir, with the necessity of soliciting at the hands of hon. members, all the consideration usually accorded to new members. And, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I have the proud satisfaction of being justified in congratulating the right hon. leader of the Government, his colleagues and the House, on the very satisfactory exhibit, concerning the great general interests of our country, that the eminent Finance Minister has placed before the House and the country, in his masterly and exhaustive Budget Speech, and upon his general conclusions in respect to the present actual position, and the well-grounded future prospects of this great Dominion of ours; all of which, Sir, are fully justified by the facts of the case. In reference to expression of opinion that I shall take the liberty to make, in regard to the fiscal policy of our