

answer, and for such arguments as this, I have simply to say that when I hear them gravely stated I hardly know for whom to feel the most contempt—for the individuals who lie and profit by their lies or for the dupes who believe and bleed. In all this one thing only does not vary, and that is the steady growth of taxation. The value of farms may fluctuate; prices may go up and prices may go down, but the number and the weight of our taxes goes on, and on, and on for ever. It was the fashion many years ago to speak of "the ignorant impatience of taxation" I think that Lord Castleragh was the author of that phrase. Well, *nous avons changé tout cela*, and in these days the true statesmen in considering the position of things here would deplore ten times more the "ignorant patience" with taxation which our people manifest. It is easier to cajole than it is to oppress, and I say that one of the worst consequences of the false theory which hon. gentlemen have developed, that it is possible to enrich a people by increasing its taxes is this, that they have thereby done away with almost the only efficient check and curb to extravagance. I have noticed this for the last eight or ten years, in fact ever since this doctrine took root in the public mind in Canada, and if I had not noticed it the growth of public expenditure would proclaim it to men who chose to open their eyes and see. But now, Sir, I hear that a reign of economy is to set in. Mr. Speaker, what new villainy is afloat? What dark mystery of iniquity is being hatched now? I must say that when I hear these gentlemen talking of economy my utmost suspicions are aroused. Can the leopard change his spots; can the Ethiopian change his skin; can we expect grapes from thorns and figs from thistles? Is it not bad enough to cook our accounts; is it not bad enough to pay \$82,929 for law costs and keep a Minister of Justice, and a Deputy Minister of Justice, and a staff and contingents besides? Is it not bad enough to pay \$327,000 for bribing newspapers as we see by these Public Accounts, without counting the cost of printing for the Immigration Department and for matters connected with legislation? Is it not bad enough to pay five or six hundred thousand dollars for putting in types and plant and new printing machinery. Is it not bad enough to see \$400,000 voted for a Franchise Bill for the express purpose of disrating many of the electors of this country? Is it not bad enough to see \$175,000 spent in 18 months for the purchase and work on one experimental farm at Ottawa, which, though it be a desirable thing, could bring us all the good that is ever likely to come from it for an expenditure of one quarter the amount? Is it not bad enough to see \$700 a year paid for each convict in the prison at Manitoba? Is it not bad enough to see \$287,000 spent for the lighting, and the heating, and the furniture, and the taking care of the grounds here and at Rideau Hall? Why, Sir, this is more than some of our most important Provinces get as their *per capita* subsidy. We absolutely spend on these trifles, on our gas bill, our water bill and outlay for keeping the grounds in order here and at Major's Hill Park and at Rideau Hall \$287,000 a year and yet the Government talks to us about economy. All over this country we find in little villages of seven or eight hundred, aye, even of three or four hundred souls, public works erected at a cost of fifteen or twenty thousand dollars as bribes to these constituencies and buildings erected which incur an expenditure of over \$1,200 a year, including interest and maintenance, for the purpose of providing shelter or a post office which does not give us a revenue of more than \$400 a year. Could this condition of things exist in England or the United States? Were I able to stand on the floor of the House of Commons or on the floor of Congress and to point to items in the Public Accounts showing that in England five or six hundred thousand pounds sterling went to subsidise the *Times*, and any other paper, which stood ready to stab some public man under the fifth rib, if in

the United States I could point to a subsidy of four millions a year paid for the purpose of retaining United States papers in the service of the Government, would that Government in the United States, or would that Government in England last for one single day? No, Sir, they would be hurled from the places that they had misused; yet in our Auditor General's Report year after year we find that two or three hundred thousand dollars are deliberately expended for no other purpose than to bribe, from one end of this Dominion to the other, some particular newspapers which it may be convenient for the Ministers to subsidise out of the public pockets. These men talk of economy! Why, look at their expenditure on public lands. The total income in 1887 was \$191,781. What was the total expenditure? To collect \$191,000 we expended \$461,474. In 1888 we did better; we collected \$217,000, and it only cost us \$426,820 to do it; and I dare say that next year we will collect \$220,000 and only spend \$420,000. Now, in that sum for the collection of revenue I include the sum charged to capital account, the sum spent in the department, the Minister's salary and contingencies, and I get this grand result which I present to these advocates of economy: in two years we have succeeded spending \$888,296 for the purpose of collecting \$488,864, in towards the bill of \$58,000,000 due on the 1st January, 1891. Sir, I won't repeat what I have said of the management of the Intercolonial Railway further than this, that when you spend \$5,750,000, counting interest, to collect \$2,980,000, it is time indeed for economy in the management of our public affairs. I will take the whole record of hon. gentlemen, during the last twenty-one years. They began in 1867, with an expenditure of \$13,500,000, when I came into office in 1874, I found bills awaiting me of \$24,250,000, though I only spent \$23,300,000; when I left office in 1878 my expenditure was \$23,500,000. You heard to-day that our expenditure for 1888, not including sums improperly charged to capital expenditure, was now \$46,713,000. There, Sir, is a record of these hon. gentlemen's past economy in two lines. I will not say anything, because really I have not time to discuss it, of that notable stroke of business of borrowing money at 3½ per cent. and lending it at 1½ per cent.; but when I look at the records of the savings banks, and when I see that the Government of Canada deem it prudent and economical to borrow thirty or forty millions at 30 per cent. above the current market rates, I must observe that it is a kind of economy which does not particularly recommend itself to my judgment, at any rate. Our position is remarkable in another respect, that, unfortunately for us, we have a very large nominal income; I say unfortunately, because when you have an apparent income of \$36,000,000 or \$37,000,000, a great many expenses, which are really very large for our means, appear to worthy people to be very small. It hardly strikes them as of the real importance it is when we talk of an expenditure of \$200,000 or \$300,000 as being important against a total income of \$36,750,000. But when we come to analyse the facts, what do we find? We find a nominal income of \$36,000,000, but after deducting the expenses of collection of the revenue and fixed charges, we find a real income of \$9,750,000, which, if you deduct the sums improperly charged to capital account, would be reduced to \$9,250,000. That is the true position of the affairs of Canada to-day; that is to say, that 75 per cent. of our whole income, in one form or other, is mortgaged. I will give the hon. gentleman the totals from his own estimates:

Interest on sinking fund.....	\$12,107,725
Subsidies.....	4,100,000
Charges for collection of revenue.....	8,774,000
Charges for Indians.....	1,078,000
Total.....	\$26,060,000

Which represent to all intents and purposes fixed charges against a nominal income of \$36,000,000. Now,