

building of 200 or 220 miles west of Winnipeg, in order that, when the road was opened from the head of Lake Superior to Winnipeg, we should have the fertile country west of Winnipeg open for settlement, so that we might have the advantage and benefit of the expenditure so far made. As you will understand, Mr. Speaker, these new works involved a large additional outlay, and I may say we feel that in making it we have acted in accordance with the wishes and opinions of our friends in and out of the House, whose desire in common with that of the whole people of the country is that the North-West may be opened up, and that the old portions of the Dominion may derive the benefits, direct and indirect, of its development. Sir, if the Government could have had their own way in the matter, apart from other considerations, they would have desired that the expenditure on public works, chargeable to capital, should not have exceeded five or six millions a year; but, under the circumstances which I have related, engagements had to be met which will involve, perhaps, the expenditure of twelve millions during the current year, and twelve or thirteen during next year. The House will understand, under these circumstances, that our difficulties are great, and that they are not diminished by the fact that we have to provide, not only for this large expenditure, and for the deficiency of two millions a year, but for a sum largely in excess of two millions. Sir, if the deficiency in the last year had only been what was estimated, our difficulties would have been less to-day than they are. I desire, Sir, in order that we may understand this matter fully, in order that our position with reference to the expenditure of the current year and of next year may be fully understood, to state that the deficiency of the last year, instead of being two millions—when we take into account the fact that under the expected change in the Tariff we received in that year property belonging to this \$700,000 of Customs more than we would have received had it not been proposed to change the Tariff, and that we also received \$600,000 from Excise for the same reason—was \$3,400,000 instead of \$2,100,000.

Mr. MILLS: Hear, hear.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: A gentleman opposite says "Hear, hear." I may explain upon what basis I make that statement to the House. In the first place, let me call the attention of the House to the estimate submitted by the late Finance Minister as to the receipts and expenditures for 1878-79. The hon. gentleman estimated that the receipts from Customs would be \$13,750,000; and the receipts were \$12,900,659. I stated that experience has shown that \$700,000 of that was received as the result of the large importation of February and March of last year, and properly belongs to this year, and would not have been received had there been no prospective change in the Tariff. The Excise receipts were estimated by the hon. gentleman to be \$5,250,000. They were \$5,390,763. It is now clearly established, Sir, that had there been no proposed change in the Excise duties, \$600,000 less would have been received during that period, that should be credited to this year. The hon. gentleman estimated the receipts from bill stamps at \$250,000; they were \$188,000. He estimated the receipts from the Post Office Department at \$1,200,000; they were \$1,172,000. He estimated the revenue from Public Works and Canals at \$1,900,000; it was \$1,863,149. The interest on investments he estimated at \$800,000; the receipts were \$592,800. The receipts from all other sources he estimated at \$700,000; they were \$412,700. The estimates as a whole amounted to \$23,850,000; the receipts were \$22,517,380. Deduct from that the \$1,300,000 on imports and Excise, which would not have been received had there been no prospective change in the Tariff, and the receipts would have been \$21,217,380. Now, then, in reference to the expenditure. The estimated expenditure was \$23,669,073; the actual expenditure reached \$24,455,381. Of this expenditure, I may say that there was an under-estimate for interest of \$285,891. This is, of course, a charge provided for by law, but the payments under this head were \$285,891 in excess of the estimate. There were also the following under-estimates:—Charges of management to the extent of \$92,180; on sinking fund, \$146,992; on election expenses, \$62,757; on pensions, \$5,323;