

we had, to reduce the debt of the country? This is the man who has the audacity to sneer at the Finance Minister of this country—who is endeavouring to relieve the country from the embarrassments brought upon us by our predecessors—this is the man who presumes to lecture the Minister of Finance as if he were a simple child, and talks of his “confused statement.” He ventured to say that the hon. the Minister of Finance owed his position to the temperance movement; that it was the means of securing him his position as Finance Minister. He ventures to insinuate that my hon. friend had dragged down the temperance cause into the low arena of party politics. Let the hon. gentleman look into his own ranks, if he wants to find men of that stamp, and he will not have to go far. There never was a party who used a great moral question to serve party purposes, utterly regardless of the effect on the public, to a greater extent than his own. Well, Sir, after these enormous deficits, one would suppose that the hon. able gentleman, in the face of his professions of economy, would have been about the last man to challenge the administration of the finances by the right hon. gentleman on my right and his Government. The hon. member for Centre Huron not only rolled up over \$8,000,000 of deficits, but he also increased the expenditure \$8,500,000 over our largest expenditure. Had he been content with the existing expenditure, we should have been saved that \$8,000,000 of deficits. The largest expenditure we ever had was in the year 1873, in which we only governed the country four or five months, and, according to a true comparative statement, that expenditure only reached \$22,300,000. In 1874-5 the increase over that was \$1,417,678. In 1875-6 the increase was \$2,152,979. In 1876-7 it was \$1,223,908. In 1877-8 the increase was \$1,203,156, and in 1878-9 the expenditure was \$2,153,381 more than our most extravagant year. There is an over-expenditure above the largest year that we were responsible for, adding \$390,000 of expenditure belonging to revenue, which the hon. gentleman charged to capital, of \$8,543,092 in the hon. gentleman's five years administration of the finances. And yet he ventures to talk to my hon. friend about economy. Standing convicted of

the grossest extravagance of any public man that ever had anything to do with financial matters in Canada, utterly reckless of the people's money, thinking only of imposing additional taxation to enable him to commit himself to those expenditures, he supposes that that is all forgotten, and, that of all men in the world, he is to be accepted as an authority on finance and economy. He challenges the estimate of my hon. friend for 1880-81, an estimate of \$25,000,000, as a monstrously extravagant one; although \$1,000,000 more money is required to pay interest on the debt and \$600,000 for the sinking fund additional to that which he had to pay in 1874, and yet he asked \$26,168,000 from this House as the lowest sum with which he could then carry on the Government of the country. In the estimate of my hon. friend there is a sum of \$200,000 to operate the Canadian Pacific Railway. That will not, I hope, cost the country a dollar. I hope to be able, by the management to which the hon. gentlemen opposite object so much, to get enough revenue from the road to balance the expenditure. I quite understand why they object to this management. There is nothing brands them more with extravagance and incapacity than their management of Government railways. They are aware of the beneficial effects of the change, and they must magnify every little accident that occurs, even if it is on account of a snow storm. Let us look at other railways, and what do we find? I had a letter from Winnipeg, in which Mr. Schreiber says that a large quantity of steel rails have been blocked on the St. Paul line by a snow storm for a week, and that there is no prospect of getting them to their destination for some time to come. Roads in the State of Maine have been blocked by the snow, and there is no section of country worse to operate on account of the snow than that along the Valley of the Metapedia. But, knowing all this, hon. gentlemen opposite are glad to magnify every accident, and I can understand the gratification they would feel if they could point to such an accident as happened only yesterday on one of the best managed roads of the country. They do this because they are afraid to listen to the exposure of the mismanagement and extravagance of their adminis-