

of the late Government during the same time. I hope, therefore, we shall not hear any more as regards the National Policy not making the people pay more money into the Treasury. It is quite plain from the admission of the Finance Minister himself that they do pay more taxes. He will not surely rise and attempt to show that the money was got in some secret way. He tells how the money was got. He says it was by excise duties and stamps, and that the late Government got the money from the same sources; and we have, under the operation of our tariff of increased duties imposed in connection with our protective policy, succeeded in making the people pay \$26,427,899.50 more than they would have paid under the operation of the policy of the preceding Government. That is the hon. gentleman's admission. There is another question to which I desire to call the attention of the House. From the inception of the scheme of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to the present time we have heard public declarations made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the people of this country would never be asked to pay one dollar to the construction of that railway. Now what is the fact? Over \$12,000,000 of the people's money, out of the surplus collected under the operations of his tariff, has gone directly into the construction of the road within the last five years. I believe I am stating the amount at something less than what I should state it; I believe over that amount I have named has gone into that railway. I should like to ask the Finance Minister, or any hon. gentleman whether one dollar will ever go back to the pockets of the people from whom it was extracted. I answer, no. No portion of that money will ever be refunded. You may say that the country will get a certain amount of money out of the sale of lands. Will it go back into the pockets of the people? Not one dollar. Yet we find hon. gentlemen prepared to assert that the tax payers of the Dominion will never be asked to pay one cent towards that work. I hold that the most important question in connection with handling the affairs of this Dominion is the increase of our population. I believe that the immigration policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been a mistake. A very large amount of money has been positively squandered and lost, and in many cases the people who have been brought out to this country have proved utterly useless. If there is any particular class of settlers that would prove beneficial to the Dominion it is the class of men possessed of some means and able to take up homes and work out their own course of life. During the last year this country has not obtained the proper stamp of immigrants; many of the men brought here were literally useless. They were worthless to us. I therefore hold that a very large amount of money has been lost owing to the manner in which the immigration policy has been treated. I hold that the next thing we should do, Mr. Speaker, is to cut off all monopolies. I believe myself that the policy adopted in the North-West in regard to the creation of these monopolies in land, with regard to the restricted manner in which lands were offered to those who went in there in search of homes, with regard to the manner in which railway land corporations and other lands were surrounded by restrictions imposed by those who held these lands, has been a drawback to the settlement of this country. The proper course would have been to leave all the lands absolutely for those who are prepared to take up homes and live upon them, and if that policy had been adopted I believe, Sir, we would have had more settlers there to-day than we have; and I believe, owing to the course of hon. gentlemen opposite, there have gone from that country many letters of disappointment from settlers to friends in the old country, telling them that the representations made to them and the offers by which they were induced to cast their lot in with the future of that country,

Mr. McMULLEN.

were highly overdrawn, and that they did not realise in full the promises made to them. I believe they found that in place of getting land wherever they liked to settle, in many cases they had to take it in out of the way places or else it was subject to restrictions which they could not carry out. And if there is anything at all which the people of the old country detest it is a system of landlordism, such as they have been struggling with in the old country, and they do not want to be subjected to that kind of thing here. If all the land had been given to them at a fixed rate, so that they would have been induced to make their homes there, it would have been the true policy of settling that country and getting that influx of population into it that we would all be so glad to see. Now, Sir, in connection with the immigration policy of the Government I may say that I had the privilege a short time ago of examining a book known as "The National Policy"—a book of which I believe some 5,000 have been issued at a cost of \$5,000 by hon. gentlemen opposite and circulated in the old country. That book I am prepared to admit is the most ingenious invention in the interest of immigration. I must say that it possesses peculiar and attractive qualities as a production, such as could not possibly emanate from any men except the most ingenious thinking lot of men you could come across. I notice that the first page of the book has a photograph of the First Minister in it, the second page has a photograph of five of his colleagues, and the third page has a photograph of five more of them. I think that is an admirable way of presenting to the people of the old country the attractions of this country. Any man looking at the pleasant kindly countenances of those eight or nine men, who would not come to the conclusion that this is a paradise, if there is one on earth, must be a fool or an idiot. I would caution hon. gentlemen opposite to be careful how they use that book. Why, Sir, if too many of the people of the old world should get the privilege of seeing that particular book, we might find ourselves face to face with a famine, for we might not be able to feed the people that would rush to this country, or give them the necessary accommodation. I notice that this year the Government have asked a smaller appropriation than last year for immigration, and I do not wonder, because I do not believe if that book is judiciously handled they will require any money at all, for it will take the place of any expenditure in that way. While I am on the point of expenditure I would refer to some matters which I think are worth looking into. There is a certain amount of expenditure in this Dominion which is quite under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite in this House. I admit that there is a certain amount of expenditure which is perhaps not fully under their control. At the same time, Sir, I hold that where we find that even under statutory regulations we are spending more money than is necessary should be spent it is our duty to retrench and curtail and cut down the amount, and amend our laws so that the expenditure shall not be in excess of the ability of the people to pay. While we were talking about the United States I was looking over what was paid there to their State Governors. I find, Sir, that in the United States they have 47 State Governors. I find that they pay these 47 men \$168,900 on the whole, or an average of \$3,600 apiece. The House will remember that those Governors have to seek their election at the hands of the people; they have to go to the polls and pass the ordeal of seeking votes, and incur all the necessary expenses connected with the election, and they hold their offices for four years. I find that we have in Canada 9 Provincial Governors and Governors of Territories, and that we pay the whole of them \$68,000, or an average of \$7,550 apiece. Therefore we pay our Lieutenant Governors in this country virtually twice as much as they pay in the United States for their State Governors. Now I hold that the State of New York, which pays its Governor \$10,000 a