

of the people than is absolutely wanted to carry on public affairs.

Fancy—

Said he—

—what would be said of a Chancellor of the Exchequer in England if he could not estimate the requirements of the public service nearer than \$2,000,000. He would be ridiculed as unable to grasp the financial conditions of the country.

In regard to the reduction of taxation how do these figures stand? The hon. ex-Minister of Finance did reduce the taxation. We have, at last—at long last—this admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite. We had it admitted by the hon. Minister of Customs the other night. He said: I admit that you reduced the taxation \$5,900,000. The hon. gentlemen, instead of reducing the taxation, since they came into power, have, as I have shown, increased the taxation, and, as I want to show just a little further. In 1891, the customs taxation was \$23,399,301. Then the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), began to reduce taxation. In 1893, the customs taxation was \$20,984,003; in 1894, it was \$19,198,114. He reduced the taxation again. In 1895, the customs taxation became \$17,640,466. That is what I call the reduction of taxation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is a reduction of revenue.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And the revenue comes from taxation. What did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), do? When the present government came in the customs taxation was \$19,000,000. He reformed his tariff so as to reduce taxation, he says, and lo, and behold, we have, this year, a customs taxation of no less than \$25,000,000. My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance, reduced it from \$23,000,000 to \$17,000,000, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), increased it from \$19,000,000, to over \$25,000,000. But, say the hon. gentlemen who compose the government, and the hon. members who support them: We have always guarded the interests of the people in the expenditure of this money; we are doing nothing of a political kind, but doing all for the public good. I want to say just a word or two as to the comments of a newspaper published in the city of Montreal, which is a tolerably strong friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. That newspaper discusses the question of the appointment of the harbour master in Montreal. It is the *Montreal Witness*, and it is a tolerably strong supporter, no better in the city of Montreal, of hon. gentlemen opposite. The *Montreal Witness* goes on to say that: Under the old regime, the harbour master got \$3,400 of a salary, and Captain Bourassa, his assistant, \$1,000, or in all, \$4,400. I am giving this as an instance of how hon. gentlemen are working in the public service. While a new appointee, a Liberal helper, a worker, a gen-

tleman who had to be satisfied by hon. gentlemen opposite, is getting \$3,000 a year, his assistant gets \$2,500. And why, says the *Witness*: Because the harbour master who was appointed, knows nothing about the business, and had to have a man to perform the duties, and in order to retain his assistant and make him look after the duties of the office, his salary had to be increased to \$2,500 a year, making a charge of \$5,500 upon the shipping of the port of Montreal, as against \$4,400 under the old regime. Of that large increase the *Witness* says:

Therefore the shipping interest of Montreal pays so much more than in what the Liberals would call the palmiest days of Tory corruption.

As the individual cannot offend against common honesty with impunity, so the government will hardly escape some retribution for such flagrant offences against the public trust as these.

Hon. gentlemen will say that it is the harbour board, but the harbour board is a creature of this government, according to the statement of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine). He said when challenged in regard to the position he had taken: I cannot do anything else; I must vote for this man, because it is a political appointment. In other words, politics first, business second, at the expense of the shipping trade of the port of Montreal. Now, then, what does the *Witness* say further?

Captain Howard was a fit man; James McShane is not. Deputations should be appointed to protest against such an appointment. By this means the government might be compelled to submit to reason. . . . It is a glaring act on the part of the government.

We know of just such instances all through Canada where the public interests are being neglected for the support of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to point out another matter in connection with the trade of Montreal. We had a discussion with regard to elevators in this House last year. We had the discussion as to whether elevators should be built by the government or whether they should be built by individuals. We had an application made by a Buffalo syndicate for the best place in the harbour of Montreal and for the best place in the harbour of Port Colborne to build elevators through which the wheat carried on our canals would have to go. Well, that application was refused by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who had given it out as his policy: that they should be government elevators for the protection of the people of Canada. He was decided. He was strong upon that question. But at once a member of the Ontario government bobs up serenely. He joins the syndicate; he waits upon the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Public Works changes his opinion and hands over to the Buffalo syndicate the best part of the harbour at Montreal, and the