

will not be oppressed as in their own land. And there is not much wonder that such is the case. Turn to our Public Accounts, and you find an expenditure of \$250,000 for the purpose of bringing emigrants to this country. Turn to our Tariff of Customs, and you find seven millions being wasted, or worse, in trying to drive the old inhabitants of Canada away. We know also that the number of bankruptcies is not reduced under the *régime* of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. the Finance Minister, following in the wake of his illustrious leader, would have us believe that so far-sighted were the bankrupts of Canada, that they rushed wholesale into bankruptcy in 1879, for fear that a law would be introduced in March or April, of 1880, to prevent them from doing so at all. Sir, this explanation reminds me of the apology made by the First Minister for allowing a private member to introduce that Bill, of which mention was made in the Speech from the Throne, and I hardly know which is the lamer, the explanation or the apology. I suggest with all humility another explanation. Possibly the members of the commercial community may have wished to pay a last delicate attention to hon. gentlemen, and went into bankruptcy to provide some sort of employment for that horde of official assignees which the Bill of my hon. friend from Stanstead is about to sweep out of existence. Now, Sir, I desire in the first place, following the track of the hon. the Minister of Finance, to deal with the financial state of the country. Thereafter, I propose to show how, in my judgment, his Tariff has affected the mass of the people of this country, and what claims he is likely to have for a renewal of the confidence of which he boasted so much—a confidence, be it remembered, which was bestowed before the people had the slightest notion of the blessings which were in store for them. The hon. gentleman stated that there had been a deficit of \$1,960,000, I think, for the year ending 30th June, 1879, and as a matter of course the hon. gentleman intimated that I, and no other, was responsible for this. I am at a loss to know whether I am to be responsible for \$3,000,000, \$3,400,000, or \$4,100,000, because all these sums were mentioned by the hon. gentleman as being respectively the true deficit of the year. But

we will assume, for the purpose of argument, that I am to be held responsible for the \$1,960,000 which the Public Accounts state to be the deficit for the past year. Sir, I decline that responsibility, and for reasons which I think some hon. gentlemen in the House and some people in the country will think reasonable and substantial. I say that deficit has been caused partly by the fact that that hon. gentleman and his colleagues expended about three-quarters of a million dollars more than we should have expended had we been in their places, and partly by that unparalleled feat of financial genius, as the *London Times* called it, whereby the hon. gentleman, with a generosity all his own, not merely threw wide open the Dominion Treasury to every importer who wanted to anticipate the new duties, but absolutely went out of his way to afford facilities through the medium of the banks to those merchants in order to put into their pockets over half the money that ought to have gone into the National Treasury. There, Sir, is the cause of the deficit, and the only cause. I say, Sir, the onus is most distinctly and clearly on the hon. gentleman. I do not refuse to bear the full responsibility of all the expenditure which we authorised, either by Order in Council or by the Estimates we brought down, but I will go no further. Permit me to contrast the condition of things in the year 1874 and that in the year 1879. In 1874 I held the hon. gentleman responsible for the expenditure which was then incurred, and this was the reason why I did so. That hon. gentleman by his several Orders in Council, and by the Estimates which he himself brought down, had made provision for the expenditure of \$23,685,000. He had further expended during the August and October Sessions of Parliament held under his *régime* the sum of \$200,000. That was before we came into office, and I have always held him and his colleagues responsible besides for the expenditure of the general election which was rendered necessary by their misconduct. However, I do not want to insist on that or on a considerable number of items which had been expended by these hon. gentlemen, and for which we afterwards got the authority of Parliament. But I point out to the House this fact, that, without taking into account the question of the general elec-