

the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1901, and the 30th June, 1902.'

The Bill was read the first time.

Hon. Mr. MILLS moved the second reading.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I know it is almost a matter of form for us to deal with a question of this kind. This Bill is somewhat of a voluminous character. Could not the hon. gentleman give us some little information as to the amount?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I may say to my hon. friend that the amount is \$49,045,275, and there are nearly \$11,000,000 chargeable to capital account; so that the total expenditure chargeable to revenue and chargeable to capital account will foot up \$60,000,000.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is useless discussing a question of this kind, unless we are prepared to reject the whole Supply Bill, and I do not suppose the House is prepared to do that. I can only wonder how it is that these gentlemen can sleep at night without the ghosts of the former Senator Scott, now Secretary of State, and the Hon. David Mills, now Minister of Justice, haunting them from the moment they enter their bedrooms until they get up in the morning. When the Conservative government had a total expenditure of about \$38,000,000, these gentlemen were horrified; the whole country was deluged, not only with placards and circulars and election dodgers, but the hon. gentlemen themselves on every stump were denouncing it as outrageous and robbery of the people.

The hon. gentleman himself, who sits opposite, when discussing the question in the west, prior to their accession to office in 1896, and which was repeated by his chief, the premier, told the people, with apparent solemnity, when the expenditure was under forty millions, that if they were in power, they could reduce the ordinary expenditure some three or four millions of dollars. It is charitable to suppose that at the time he thought they could. He did not have experience. He now tells us it is over forty-nine instead of thirty-eight millions. If I read the estimates right, parliament is voting the immense sum of \$67,326,729. I do not wish to be understood as saying that

all this money will be expended this year, but the country is committed to it. That is not all. We were told a few days ago by the hon. gentlemen opposite that their consciences could not allow them to increase the salaries of the judges, because it would be adding so much more to the debt of the country. There are two or three items to which I wish to direct attention. One is the additional subsidy to Prince Edward Island, which my hon. friend from that province says is not enough, and they are going to demand more. That increases the debt of the country directly one million dollars, because capitalized at 3 per cent it amounts to that. We are to have three additional judges in the province of Quebec, two additional judges in British Columbia, and one additional judge in the Yukon. That will add about \$25,000 per annum for the judiciary. That capitalized at 3 per cent represents seven hundred odd thousand dollars added to the debt. I am making this calculation on the basis the hon. gentleman laid down himself. Then the sessional indemnity which we have been discussing is another hundred and fifty thousand dollars, or an addition of five million dollars to the debt of the country. So that there are six or seven millions of dollars added to the debt of the country by these items. Then there is the settlement of an old claim of Nova Scotia amounting to \$681,000. Every government, from the time of the transfer of those railways, had repudiated that claim, as having no legal basis. Sir John Thompson, in his report, said distinctly that these transactions did not impose upon the Dominion the claim which was made. I heard a very passionate speech delivered by the Minister of Finance last night on this question, but he never touched the main issue as to the action of Nova Scotia. Now, Sir Leonard Tilley was, I think, as keen a representative of the province of New Brunswick as they have ever had since confederation. He always repudiated the claim which New Brunswick made in connection with their railway running up to Moncton. That was investigated over and over again, and the Finance Minister at that time declared they had no legal claim under the law, or under the Confederation Act, but now these gentlemen have given a large