

million dollars, which had been often pointed out, that were improperly added by the late Finance Minister to the accounts of that year, and properly belonged to the succeeding year. This contention, he thought, his hon. friend before him (Mr. Tilley) was prepared to justify. They had insisted upon it in his defence while he was absent from the House, and while he held a position which prevented him from entering into the discussion and vindicating, as he had now vindicated, his position. It might be safely asserted, that in round numbers, at least \$950,000, improperly added by his successors to the expenditure of 1873-74, should be deducted from the total increase before stated, bringing it down to \$8,870,322, from the total expenditure of 1873-74, reducing it to \$22,466,316, and added to the expenditure of 1874-75, making the total of that fiscal year, the first clear year of Reform rule, \$24,663,071. The correctness of this statement was virtually proved by comparing the figures with those of the second fiscal year of the rule of their economical friends, the loud-mouthed advocates of retrenchment. That year, 1875-76, presented the startling aggregate of \$24,488,372, and that of the two succeeding years, which completed their record, was only kept down by a device which could not redound to their credit. While other items of administrative expenditure were increasing in a startling ratio, although the revenue was constantly shrinking, by the expenditure of 1876-77, when the great depression was fairly upon us, paralysing trade and carrying disaster into every branch of industry, the reckless policy of the late Government entailed upon the country an outlay, chargeable upon revenue, of \$23,519,301, which was only kept down to those frightful figures by striking out \$428,079 from the Militia items, and \$682,128 from that of Public Works chargeable to revenue. As compared with the outlay in those Departments the year previous, a reduction of \$1,110,207 was thus obtained, but for which the total for 1876-77 would have been \$24,629,508. The same plan was adopted in 1877-78. The Militia item was \$360,404 less, and the Public Works item \$950,347 less than in 1875-76. The total expenditure

of the year, notwithstanding these abnormal reductions, was \$23,503,158, and, but for them, would have reached \$24,813,909. There could be no merit in bringing about a reduction by the contrivances now exposed. If Public Works, chargeable to revenue, had been completed, as they had been led to believe they would be, the expenditure, of course, would cease. As to the Militia, they knew who presided over that Department, and his antecedents would lead them to believe that he would not resist any reduction of our power to defend the flag. In every case, it would be found that the expenditure of the Liberal-Conservative Government, upon which such fierce denunciations had been poured out by hon. gentlemen opposite, especially by the late Premier and the late Finance Minister, had been exceeded under their Administration. It would be an easy task to justify, item by item, every figure for which his hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) and his old colleagues and predecessors were in any way responsible. In the spring Session of 1873, the late Finance Minister, who had been virulently opposed by the *Globe* and its party at his election, in August, 1872, made his prophetic speech which he had often quoted, but of which, unfortunately, no extended record remained in the public archives. He claimed, however, on the strength of that vaticination, credit for foreseeing the commercial crisis which was impending, and which burst upon the country like a tornado, in the autumn of 1873. It had already spread panic and dismay over the United States, when the hon. gentleman and his colleagues took the seals of office, and it had extended to Great Britain and the Continent before the hon. gentlemen met Parliament, at the end of March, 1874. He (Mr. Plumb), in common with many others who heard the Budget speech of 1874, was not aware of the mental peculiarities of the hon. gentleman who uttered it—they did not know the depth of the immedicable wound which had been inflicted upon his ambition, and his self-love, nor the bitterness and persistency of his hatred. His speech was violent beyond any precedent, and it might have been considered unfair, and, perhaps, not over courageous or chivalrous, to attack