

two or three years from the British market, and an increase in the importation of the articles, notwithstanding the preferential duty, from the United States. The public accounts show that, and it is not necessary for me to elaborate the subject. After the present Minister of the Interior had given vent to his opinion as to what constituted the platform and policy of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier spoke as follows :

Do you imagine there is any justification for this extraordinary expenditure? The Conservatives tell us there is a justification. Population has increased, they say. Oh, yes; it has increased 9 per cent, but the expenditure has increased 100 per cent. (Sic.) There can be no justification for such an expenditure, when, as has been stated, the great bulk of it is a corrupt expenditure.

They tell us that if we were in power we could not retrench and economize. But I do not believe that it will be a difficult task. It would not be a very difficult task to economize to the extent of one, two, three millions—and Mr. Mills told his constituents a few days ago that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

I will show presently how that declaration on the part of the present Minister of Justice has been carried out. It was merely an ebullition of hon. gentlemen who were trying to catch the popular will at the moment, forgetting what the duties of statesmen really are, and appealing to the prejudices of people by giving utterance to sentiments of that kind. Then we have that great economist, Sir Richard Cartwright, who held out in the following style :

For my own part I do not hesitate to tell him (the Finance Minister) that I consider a yearly expenditure of forty million dollars, or thirty-eight million dollars, altogether too much for the resources of Canada.

I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the government that has been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of thirty-eight million dollars a year for federal purposes.

Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.

Sir, there is very little use for honourable gentlemen whining over this matter.

They ought to try and meet it, and the way to meet it is to reduce our present establishment, to reduce your present extravagant mode of government and to reduce your extravagant ideas.

I have said before, and I repeat it, that \$38,000,000 is, in my judgment, a monstrous sum for this people to be called on to provide for.

I might go on for hours giving extracts of that character from the utterances of the gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches, and who are guiding the destinies of Canada. We know the organ which speaks for them on almost every occasion. But lately, by the by, I saw it announced, when the attention of the House of Commons was called to a demand made by the Toronto

Globe that the present occupant of the seat for West Huron in the House of Commons should retire on account of the gross frauds which have been proven before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that newspaper statements should not always command much attention. I congratulate the Premier on the fact that he has arrived at that conclusion, so far as the utterances of the Toronto *Globe* are concerned. However, there was a time when they did not speak so disparagingly of that paper, that is when that paper gave utterance to sentiments of this kind :

The first duty of the Laurier Government is to put an end to the abuses of the subsidy system.

We have an illustration of how these subsidy abuses are being put an end to, in the bill passed yesterday.

To set its face against every mere boodling enterprise. We must turn over a new leaf in order to maintain the public credit abroad, no less than to introduce a higher order of public morality at home.

Then there was a letter written by Sir Richard Cartwright, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the president of an organization, known as the Patrons, in Ontario. Among other things he told the Patrons that he was at one time with them on the following planks of their platform:—first, "economy of administration." We have an illustration of that in the Supply Bill before us, which, as I shall show presently, pledges this country to an expenditure of nearly seventy millions.

Secondly, purity and independence of Parliament.

We have had that exemplified in the fact that, notwithstanding the declaration of the ministry of the present day, that men who accepted office while holding seats in Parliament were the mere slaves of the administration of the day, three or four members have been sent from the House of Commons to this chamber, quite legitimately and quite properly in some cases, but in one or two cases it was in order to create vacancies in constituencies in order that those who had been appointed to office, but who had never held a seat in Parliament, could retain their positions by obtaining seats which had been secured by the elevation of commoners to the Senate. The Finance Minister is one, the Minister of Railways and Canals is another, and the Minister of Public Works a third. There are three of them. They all secured seats in the Commons by vacan-