

	Population.	Rate.
San Francisco	233,959	13 08
Lockport, N.Y.	15,000	8 09
Kansas City, Mo.	55,785	24 00

Now, Sir, I want to give you some of the more heavily taxed cities, and we will commence with the favored city of my hon. friend, Bangor. And let me remark in this connection that the hon. gentleman said in his speech: Now, I want you to understand that I want to be fair; I want you to understand that I have tried to be fair in these comparisons. Now, Sir, we will see how fair he was. He takes Bangor with 16,856 of a population, and a municipal indebtedness of \$157.87 *per capita*. Then Elizabeth, New Jersey, has a population of 28,229, and a debt of \$195.28 *per capita*. Jersey City, N.Y., has a population of 120,722, and a *per capita* debt of \$127.49. Memphis has a population of 33,000, and a *per capita* municipal indebtedness of \$135.59. Middletown has a municipal indebtedness of \$119.97 *per capita*. I may say that there are eight cities of the United States with a *per capita* municipal indebtedness of over \$100, and one of these is Bangor; Bangor stands at the head of the list except one. Now this is the fair comparison the hon. member for King's would lead us to understand he was disposed to make in dealing with the debt of the cities of the United States. I was rather amused when he came to deal with the municipal taxes of the Dominion, that he should have gone to Ontario. He appeared to be glad to take the figures as set down in the Province of Ontario, notwithstanding the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have lost no opportunity in criticising in very severe terms the manner in which the affairs of the Province of Ontario have been managed. They have tried to show that its money has been squandered, that its business has been badly managed by the very able and efficient gentlemen who have been at the head of that Government for so many years. But after all, when they want to make a comparison in this Dominion they have to go to Ontario, of all the Provinces, to find the most favorable standard. This is a confession on their part that its affairs are very well handled. I cannot find out, for the life of me, how he came to make out the entire municipal taxation of the Dominion to be \$4 per head. He appears to have borrowed that opinion from some quarter—I do not know where. I cannot tell on what data he proceeded, because I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there is anything at all surrounded with difficulty it is the endeavour to ascertain exactly the municipal taxation of this Dominion, that is, the amount collected in each municipality for municipal and school purposes. However, he gives it to the House at \$4. He says with a flourish of eloquence: I present these figures to the House and to the country. I think, he says, they will stand investigation. Well, Sir, that reminds me of a story I once heard of an Irishman who came to this country. He landed at New York, and engaged to an American. After the American had had him some time in his employ he thought he would have a little fun out of him, so he said to him one fine evening: "Pat, go out doors and count the stars for me." Pat went out, and after a while he came in and said there were 9,876,000 or some big figure of that kind. "Oh," says the American, "you must be mistaken; how can you be so sure of the number?" "Well, sir," said Pat, "I am quite certain that I am right, and if you do not believe me you can go outside and count them yourself." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has presented these figures; wherever he got them I do not know. But he says: I present them to the House, I present them to the country, and I am prepared to say that I believe that I am correct. Well, Sir, I do not believe that he is at all near correct. I believe when he took that amount as the municipal taxation of the Province, he made up his mind that he would take an amount that would come within the limit so as to show that we have a less municipal taxation than that the United States in.

I do not think we can get such evidence as will enable us to come to a correct conclusion on a question of this kind. I believe the only possible way to make a comparison is to take the entire debt of the United States, the state, federal and municipal debts, and putting them together compare the gross amount with the Dominion debt, the provincial debt and the municipal debt combined. We have done that, and I am sorry to have to admit that our debt exceeds that of the United States by \$1.27 per head. I took considerable trouble to read over the hon. gentleman's speech. Last year in addressing the House he said he had read over the speech of the leader of the Opposition three times. He said he found nothing in that speech worthy of notice unless it was the "may be," "may be," "may be," which occurred several times. I read over the hon. gentleman's speech recently delivered once, then I read it again, and part of it a third time, and the only thing that attracted my attention was the word *metropoli*. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got the word; but all great men, Mr. Speaker, in this world are known either by having invented something or being the author of a book or the author of a word. The late Lord Brougham was known to the after generations of his day as the inventor of a carriage, and one of the Dukes of Wellington is remembered as the inventor of a pair of boots. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) will no doubt be known by future generations as the author of a word, *metropoli*. I was quite amused with the very determined manner in which the hon. gentleman assailed three of the prominent members of this side of the House, the ex-Finance Minister, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). He made an effort to overthrow the whole of them. I began to think that possibly the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) would feel that his position was in some danger when the hon. member for King's made such a very elaborate statement and went so largely into figures and, as he thought, into facts, but I am sorry to say were largely fiction; I began to think I say that the hon. member for Cardwell would begin to think that he should try and secure a position on the Treasury Benches immediately, because when the hon. member for King's took his seat he was quite satisfied that he had performed the duties that devolved upon him with the greatest amount of ability. I do not know how long that hon. gentleman may be asked to remain on the back benches, but in his own estimation he should be advanced to a front seat before very long. There is one question I wish to bring before the House, and it is this: It is not very often we get admissions from hon. gentlemen opposite that are of use to us as going to show the fallacy and injustice of the policy which they advocate and uphold. The Finance Minister in delivering his Budget Speech made some admissions that struck me forcibly when he made them, and I then thought that if I had the privilege or pleasure of offering some remarks during the debate I would undoubtedly allude to them. He stated that the ex-Government, during the time they had been in power from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879, five years, had under the then tariff extracted from the people's pockets \$98,295,770.34; while from July 1st, 1879, to July 1st, 1884, it appears that under the operation of their policy they have extracted from the people \$124,723,689.84, or \$26,426,899.50 more than the previous Government took from the people. It is not often we get such an admission. We have often met hon. gentlemen opposite on the political stump, and they have always declared—and I will not be surprised if some of them still persist in declaring it—that under the National Policy the people pay no more taxes. Then where has the money come from? Where did the Finance Minister get his extra \$26,000,000, which he declares he got? The hon. gentleman has extracted \$5.88 per head during five years more than was extracted under the administration of