

tion, that hon. gentleman had spent or taken authority to expend \$23,885,000 in 1873-4, while our actual expenditure was \$23,316,000, or \$568,000 and odd less than the amount that gentleman had estimated for and taken authority to spend. Now, according to his own statement, throwing in the Orders in Council for sums brought forward by us, and allowing for the extra expenditure on account of the elections, which he estimates at \$65,000, the total expenditure we had authorised was \$23,920,000, of which I may remark a very considerable proportion, as he himself admitted, was not expended. He therefore expended last year some \$535,000 more than we are responsible for, while we expended \$568,000 less than he had taken authority to expend in 1873-4, and that I say constitutes a strong *prima facie* case against the hon. gentleman. Still I am not disposed to rest my case there, but I will point out to the House where I think these gentlemen were guilty of needless and improper expenditures. In the first place I do not admit that the hon. gentleman had the right to charge me for interest—at any rate more than to a small extent—on loans effected after I left office. He assumes what he has no right to do, that I intended to effect a loan of three million pounds sterling. This was not my purpose, but I leave that question till I can refer to his remarks about his recent loan. When we come to ordinary expenditure, what do we find? Why, Sir, we find that these hon. gentlemen, under the head of ordinary expenditure, have expended a very considerable number of sums which I feel perfectly certain, had we remained in office, would not have been expended. We find under the head of Civil Government that, whereas we expended in our last year \$823,000, these gentlemen expended \$861,000, of which about \$20,000 were for contingencies. We find that, under the head of Militia, whereas we expended \$618,000, these gentlemen expended \$130,000 more. Now, I do not charge them with the whole of that amount. I think it is probable that a portion of that may have been legitimate enough expenditure. But I say that, had we been in office, the Militia expenditure would have been at least \$60,000 less than it was. In the matter of Legislation these hon. gentlemen caused an extra-

gant expenditure in two ways. First, in consequence of the Minister of Finance not being prepared to bring down his measures to the House for many weeks after we met, and secondly, as the returns laid on the Table of the House show, by permitting the expenditure of this House to run riot until, on the vote for \$8,000 for sessional clerks, messengers and pages, there was an expenditure close on \$30,000. Sir, for that class of expenditure I refuse all accountability. Nor do I think that we are chargeable with the fact that the hon. the Minister of the Interior, as the hon. member for Bothwell showed last Session, saw fit to put nearly five quarters instead of four in the ordinary expenditure for Indians on that year. Under the head of charges for collection of revenue, I would also point out that, whereas we expended \$1,724,000 for the service of the Post Office in 1878, these gentlemen expended \$1,784,000, while in the following item they expended \$400,000 more than we demanded for the task of maintaining railways and canals; and \$200,000 more apparently than they themselves so late as the month of May deemed necessary. That expenditure may or may not be defensible; I am not in a position to form an opinion on the subject, but I do know that my hon. friend beside me spent \$200,000 less during his last year than his successors saw fit to expend. I remark in connection with this subject that I know too well from the state of things that confronted us when we became responsible for the administration of the affairs of this country, from the shameful way in which those roads were run down, how easy it is largely to diminish for a time the apparent expenditure on great public works. I also know how many hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions, it cost us to put those roads in proper condition. If the information we have received from the Maritime Provinces be correct, there is an exceeding probability that something of that kind will occur again in a few years. I may add, for the hon. gentleman himself admits it, that there is at least \$100,000 for which he and not we were responsible, and therefore I submit that the hon. gentleman had no right whatever to attempt to hold us responsible for any