

charges on the Department. The increase in the Civil Service Estimates, as hon. gentlemen will notice by the Estimates on the Table of the House, is \$130,000—a larger amount than in any year for some time back. I may mention that of that sum, \$32,000 was formerly paid out for salaries to officers in that service. Then in the vote for the Geological Survey—it having been in the Department of the Postmaster-General, alone are nineteen or twenty-one men, I forget which, who were employed as packers, and paid out of contingencies, but who have been transferred under the Act to the Civil Service expenditure, making in that item an addition of something like \$13,000. In the Department of the Interior, the work has grown so rapidly, and is becoming so enormous, that the expenditure, in order to keep up with the requirements of the vast settlement in that country, in the way of the survey, sale and allotments of land, has necessarily been largely increased, the amount in that Department being altogether \$130,000. The hon. Minister of Agriculture asks for next year \$200,000 more than was voted for the present year. The largely increased immigration, and the amount given in aid of immigration by the Department of Agriculture will not, I think, be objected to by Parliament or the country, if the results prove to be such as are anticipated. The Public Works expenditure it is proposed to increase by \$265,000. As we have the means, there is a demand for an increased number of these public buildings, and in many cases it will be found that the rent now paid for buildings used by the Customs and Excise Departments; by the Weights and Measures offices, and by the Post Office Department, will only be about equivalent to the interest of the proposed expenditure for those purposes. The increase in mail subsidies will be \$48,000. This is to meet the expenditure—provided arrangements are made, and they are now in course of completion—for two lines of steamers, each running monthly—which, of course, under this arrangement will make a fortnightly service—from Germany and Belgium to Canada, for the purpose of encouraging and extending the trade and emigration between Canada and those countries. Then there is an increase in lighthouse and coast service of \$22,000. This is in the direction of practically cheapening freight, and increasing the value of all articles exported, and decreasing the cost of articles imported into the Dominion. The increase in Customs expenditure is \$45,000, of which \$25,000 is in Manitoba and the North-West. This increase will be readily understood by hon. gentlemen when I tell them that the probabilities are, that this year Manitoba will be the third port in the Dominion, so far as revenue is concerned, so that the increased expenditure cannot be avoided, the increased work rendering it imperative. The same thing may be said with regard to Excise. The increase on public works and canals is \$26,000; Dominion lands \$30,000; and there will be a probable expenditure for militia purposes, under the Bill now before the House, to the extent of about \$150,000. To these sums will have to be added—if Parliament sustains the proposition—the bonus to be paid to the iron manufacturers during next year. Under these circumstances, Sir, while nominally there appears to be a large increased expenditure, there will be practically, even in the next year, a very considerable return from the Departments where that money is expended. And I may add this—that, although I stated that last year the taxation requisite to meet the expenditure of the Dominion was 13 cts. a head less than the average of 1874–78, and for the current year 1 cent. more, the increase now proposed will, if you take the average of the three years, leave the taxation just about what it was from 1874 to 1878, notwithstanding the fact, as I stated before, that at the close of this year we shall have expended \$11,000,000 on the Pacific Railway, on the enlargement of our canals, on the extension and equipment of the Intercolonial Rail-

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

way, and on the surveys of the North-West. Under these circumstances, Sir, I think the country will not object to the increased expenditure, when they find that the taxation is not increased. Now, Sir, having proceeded thus far, may I be permitted to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the verdict of June last. It was a very marked verdict. It was marked, Sir, because of the statement by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the country was misled, in 1878, when the Tariff resolutions were submitted by the Government. It was alleged that the statements made throughout the country in the Elections of 1878 were not justified by the Tariff that was brought down. It was known that a general policy had been propounded by the right hon. leader of the Government, then the leader of the Opposition, with reference to protection to the industries of the country. It was known that in the Elections of 1878 that general policy was presented to the country. But when we came here in 1879, and in subsequent years, and put that policy into the form of a resolution for the consideration of Parliament, then we found hon. gentlemen rising in the House and charging individual members, and the Government as a whole, with having failed to carry out what they had pledged themselves to carry out before the Elections of 1878. Well, Sir, we have the satisfaction of knowing that after that policy had been put into form, after it had been adopted by Parliament, after it had been in operation for three years, and the people were appealed to with reference to its details, two-thirds of the people's representatives are now in this House to sustain that policy. There is the still more significant fact, Sir, that eight gentlemen who sat on that side of the House, and who had been members of the Free Trade Government previous to 1878, with the Free Trade ex-Speaker, lost their elections. That verdict was very marked, also, because we were told in the late Parliament that this policy would have the effect of driving out of the Union the smaller Provinces. Has it driven out the smaller Provinces? What is the verdict? Two-thirds of the members elected in June last from the smaller Provinces are sent here to support this policy. And I think hon. members who were members of the late House will pardon me if I say that I feel a special pride and satisfaction in standing here to-night as the representative of New Brunswick; because those who were here during the last three or four years know how often I was taunted with the statement that I misrepresented my native Province. Unfortunately, we had but few supporters here after 1878 sustaining this policy; but at the General Elections of 1882, what was the verdict? Though I was specially charged with misrepresenting what the policy of the Government would be, a majority has been sent from my Province to sustain this policy. Sir, the majority of the vote was larger for the policy than the representation in the House. That is another important fact. I took the liberty to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition, last Session and the Session before: "If you expect ever to come to this side of the House, you must accept the National Policy." Now, I hold that the verdict given in June last was most emphatic, and proves the truth of my statement, that hon. gentlemen opposite must accept the National Policy before they can hope to come on this side of the House. The fiat has gone forth, and it will be perpetual. And it is this: that the hand must perish that attempts to remove one single stone from the foundation, or one single arch from the superstructure of the national edifice whose foundation was so carefully laid and superstructure so skillfully superintended by the right hon. gentleman whose name I need not mention in this House. I said, in 1830 and 1831, that whenever an Election came, this policy would be sustained, that after it had been five years on the Statute-book; and after having been perfected from time to time, it would never be repealed.