

Under these circumstances, I desire to lay upon the Table of the House the resolutions that, when we are in Committee, I propose to move in confirmation and perfection of that policy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have had again the pleasure of listening to the financial statement from the hon. Finance Minister of the Dominion. It is a statement of a great deal of importance to every hon. member of this House, as, no doubt, it is to every citizen of the country who takes any interest in the affairs of State. I have listened, in common with others, as carefully as I could to the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman who administers our finances. It is impossible, of course, to remember all the points, to recollect all the statements, much less to carry in one's mind or jot down as they are uttered all the figures and tables of figures that may be given; but I think I have been able to gather, from the statements that have fallen from the hon. gentleman's lips, enough to enable me to, at any rate, follow in some measure the line of his argument, and to notice at some length some of the statements he has made and the deductions he has drawn therefrom. No doubt the debate will go on, and many other hon. members will take part in it, and it will be quite possible for them, when the figures we have listened to are in print and in the possession of hon. members, to carefully scan them and see whether the interpretation placed upon them by the hon. Finance Minister can be fully borne out. This task I leave in the hands of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who, I am sure will be able to deal intelligently with the subject. Following then the line adopted by the hon. Finance Minister, I am brought first to consider the question of administration with reference to the public expenditure. The hon. gentleman knew that the Public Accounts were in the hands of members; he knew they showed that there had been a very great increase of expenditure; and he did what it was only natural he should do, he sought to break the force of that fact by attempting to explain and justify each item, in order, if possible, to save himself, and the Administration of which he is one of the able members, from blame and censure in that regard. Nor am I disposed to say that he altogether failed in showing that in some of this increased expenditure there is a corresponding benefit derived from the receipts of different Departments in which this increased expenditure is made; nor do I desire, though the hon. gentleman seemed to think it was part of our policy to withhold this information from the public, to withhold it from them. I am quite willing that the people of this country should understand, that while we have increased the expenditure upon our railways and canals, we have also increased the revenue therefrom, and that that should be taken into account. But, Sir, the point I think the country is interested in is this: that in all these explanations, in all these justifications, the people are sometimes apt to be bewildered and to say: "Why can't you Members of Parliament, in dealing with figures, give us some figures that may be taken and accepted as correct—without explanation, without justification, without explaining away. Why not give us figures upon which we can all agree?" Now, Sir, I think that this is the duty of the Government, and I think that it is my duty, addressing myself now to the task of attempting to reply, though it may be but feebly, to the utterances of the hon. Finance Minister. And if I do that, I will have but little difficulty in convincing the people that the hon. gentlemen opposite who, when in Opposition for five years, charged upon the Administration of that day, gross extravagance, because the public expenditure had been increased, are themselves guilty of still greater extravagance. I will be able to charge back upon those hon. gentlemen, and it will not be for them to resent anything in this direction, they themselves having adopted that line of criticism when they occupied this side of the House. The figures I propose

to take are those of the official documents furnished by the Government to the House; the figures I shall adduce, will be figures not cooked in any manner by myself, but those placed in our hands by the Government of the day. And am I not fair in doing so? While I admit the hon. Finance Minister has a right to make explanations as to the increase in various directions, he will not forget that the same state of things prevailed under the Mackenzie Administration—that if there is justification now, there was justification then; that if there is an increased expenditure and an increased revenue now, there was an increased revenue following an increased expenditure then. Therefore, for the purposes of comparison—and it is by comparison we learn—all the specious arguments of the hon. gentleman must be cast aside, and we must take the figures as they are furnished to us in the Public Accounts, and judging from them we must determine what the record of this Government has been. I do not desire to go too far back in the history of the country; I, therefore, make brief mention of the fact that, while the present Government were in power seven years prior to the Mackenzie Administration, they justified the charge that we have to make upon this occasion upon them—that they increased at an enormous rate, and with prodigious speed, the public expenditure; that in their seven years they ran it up from \$13,000,000 to \$23,000,000; that they ran the controllable expenditure from \$3,000,000 to \$8,000,000. Then they were succeeded by an Administration, who, for five years, conducted the affairs of this country, and I propose now to look at the record of that Government and to compare it, not with the record of this Government in the seven years preceding, for that is past and gone, but to compare it with the record of this Government for the five years that have succeeded the period, taking the Estimates for the coming year 1883-84. What are the facts, Sir? When the Mackenzie Administration came into power the expenditure was \$23,316,316. They remained in power five years, and when they went out of power it had increased to \$24,455,381, or an increase of \$1,139,065 during the five years. Now, Sir, we are taking the Estimates that have been placed upon the Table for the year 1883-84, and what do they show? Simply an increase of a little over \$1,000,000 as the Mackenzie Administration showed? No, Sir, but it exhibits an increase of \$5,734,619. These are the bare facts. Looking at them we can readily understand how desirable it was on the part of the hon. Finance Minister, that he should attempt some explanation to account for this rapid increase, which explanation is of no avail, inasmuch as the mitigating circumstances mentioned by him operated under the Mackenzie Administration as well as under his. The expenditure when those gentlemen who denounced the Mackenzie Administration for their extravagance went out of power, was \$24,455,381; to-day, by the Estimates placed upon the Table of the House, the hon. Finance Minister asks us to give him \$30,250,000 to carry on the affairs of the country. Sir, there is another test with reference to the economical management of the affairs by the Government, and that is the ordinary expenses of the Government—the controllable expenditure; that expenditure, which a gentleman who is now a member of the Government, during the time of the Mackenzie Administration, declared was as much under the control and the management of the Ministry of the day as were their household expenses. When the hon. member for East York took possession of the Government he found the controllable expenditure was \$8,324,076. He administered the public affairs for five years, and when he left office he left the controllable expenditure at \$6,941,577. Instead of increasing the controllable expenditure, he succeeded in decreasing it by \$1,382,499. But, Sir, what is the record of the hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to this controllable expenditure since they have attained power? Taking their expenditure for a like period of five years,