

and the Minister of Justice said it could be done for \$4,000,000 less. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the members of the Conservative government were "robbers great and robbers small," but the hon. gentlemen are now in power themselves and it is all lovely. They receive a good salary themselves and they manage to pension their poor relations on the people of this country, their nephews, their uncles and their aunts, and they are perfectly satisfied. I can tell them that everything is not lovely with the people of this country. The people are watching them, and the hon. gentlemen will have to give an account of this session of Parliament to the people of the country, and the sooner the better. They have increased the expenditure and cannot give any proper explanation of why they propose to spend all this money. They have increased the railway subsidies, and I am satisfied that it is against the interests of the country that they should be increased. They should be cut down to the smallest amount possible, and confined to assisting the people that are suffering for want of railway accommodation in the thinly settled districts. But that is not the true object. The object is to get support for this government who have violated all the pledges they have made to the people. They know they have to do something before the people will support them. The report goes forth now that the country is prosperous. I can state that the hon. gentleman knows very little about it. The government have increased the indebtedness of the country by millions and they are now discounting the future, and they say that the country is prosperous because the imports are large. I do not care about the imports, but I want to see the exports increased. I know that members of Parliament and ministers of the Crown will tell you that the more you import the better off you are, the more you buy the better you are off, whether you pay for it or not. I do not hold that view, but this government appears to be going in that way. Speaking of docks, I have been told that some of the docks in the county that the Minister of Finance represents are going to cost from \$1,000 to \$70,000. I have been watching the discussion in the House of Commons, and a gentleman tells me that a frog cannot get water enough to swim in at some of the places where they are going to build docks. Of course that does not refer to all of them.

What is that done for? The Finance Minister has the fear of the people before his eyes, but has not the fear of the Lord, and he must spend money to get the people of the county to support him. This is the third year this government has been in power. They think they will get a great deal of credit for what they have done to enlarge the routes for trade and commerce, and one would think the country is progressing so rapidly that the trade of the country is going to amount to a great deal. I do not care about the trade of the country unless it pays us something. They are going too fast in some particulars, but there is one matter in which they are not going fast enough, and that is the canals. If the expenditure we made on the canals of this country is going to pay us at all, we must have and we ought to have had long ago, the proper harbours at the head of the Welland Canal on Lake Erie for the commerce of the country. But these gentlemen thought they knew all about it and what have they done? Why did they not prepare this work when they knew the St. Lawrence Canal would be finished in a few years? But they would not do it. All at once, without rhyme or reason, they went to Lake Erie, procured a tug and went to Buffalo and prepared a plan to spend \$5,000,000 of the people's money to quarry a harbour out of the rocks at Port Colborne. I have brought this question before the people of the country, and I say that both governments are to blame, as far as the harbours at the head of the Welland Canal are concerned. If any hon. gentleman will look at the *Hansard* of 1875 he will see that I warned the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie as to what he should do then. But somebody had an interest in covering up a blunder committed formerly, and the government went on and made a woeful mistake. There were two mistakes that were excusable, but I called the attention of Alexander Mackenzie to that when they decided to make fourteen feet of water the draft of the canals from Lake Erie to Montreal and requested the government to select Port Maitland as the harbour on Lake Erie but they did not. That was a sad mistake, but this that they are making now is the worst mistake of all. They are going to spend \$5,000,000. The plans are now ready. They have put a small amount in the estimates, four or five hundred thousand dollars—a small amount to do that