

statements that had been made by the hon. the ex-Finance Minister with regard to the dissatisfaction, the absence of that contentment and cordial feeling that existed in this country some twelve years ago, and he characterised the statement of the ex-Finance Minister as untrue and unwise. I have to say that I believe the feeling to-day in this Dominion is not by any means so cordial as it was twelve years ago. I believe, from the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have from time to time and from Parliament to Parliament attempted to interfere with and thwart and annoy the Provinces of this Dominion by interfering with matters that they had a right to legislate on themselves, that they are responsible for a very great portion of the discontent that now exists; but the hon. member for King's was a party to that action. On every single measure that was brought forward to interfere with the rights and the privileges of the Provinces he was prepared to cast his vote with hon. gentlemen on that side in favor of that interference. Last year, when a question came up with respect to matters of the most vital importance to the Province of Ontario, he recorded his vote in favor of the rights of the Province of Quebec, but on the other hand he recorded his vote against the rights and privileges of the people of the Province of Ontario. Action of that kind from year to year on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite has caused a great deal of the feeling and a great deal of the dissatisfaction that now exists in the breasts of the people of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman from King's went into a very elaborate and extensive argument to show, if he possibly could, that the debt of Canada was not equal to that of the United States. He took to task the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as well as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and went into an extensive shower bath of figures to show us that the debt of the United States was in excess of the indebtedness of this country, and the taxes collected there were in excess of the taxes collected here. I have taken the opportunity of looking over and comparing the figures he submitted to the House, and I am prepared to say that the entire debt of the United States, according to the last returns which we have in our possession, is \$1,832,500,000. Taking their population at 56,000,000, that is \$32.68 per head. The net national debt of Canada, taken at \$200,000,000—and I am sure that it is a great deal more than that, I am satisfied there is no gentleman even on that side of the House who will dare to question a statement putting the net national debt of this Dominion at that figure at this moment—with a population of 4,500,000, gives a net debt of \$44.44 per head. I know that the hon. gentleman, in presenting the figures to the House which he did on that occasion, deducted from the gross debt of the Dominion the amount that stood charged against the several Provinces at the time that Confederation was inaugurated, he said: These are provincial debts, we have no right to take these into account in counting up the debt of this Dominion, we have a right to place those where they were before Confederation. I look upon that as a fallacious way of going to work to calculate the present indebtedness of the Dominion. The erection of these buildings which we occupy was part of the then debt of the Provinces. Will the hon. gentleman from King's dare to say that the amount of money spent in the construction of these buildings should not be counted as part of the Dominion debt? But still, when he proceeded with the calculation and found that, unless he made a deduction of that kind, he could not bring out the figures to suit his idea, he fell back into that as a means of doing it, that being the only way he possibly could bring out the calculation in anything like a favorable light to this country. The net debt of this country, then, is \$11.76 greater than that of the United States. The entire debt of the United States at present, national, state and municipal, is \$2,887,113,069.57,

Mr. McMULLEN.

or *per capita* for 56,000,000, \$51.52. The entire debt of Canada, Dominion, provincial and municipal, is \$257,600,000, or \$52.79 per head, or \$1.27 a head more than the entire debt of the United States. I contend that that is a very serious state of affairs in the interests of this country. I contend that, when we have got to compare our present financial position with the country that unfortunately had an internal war that doubled and trebled its debt, and that we never had, and consider that to-day, with a limited population and an extensive territory and many developments to make in the interests of our country, we stand \$1.27 a head in debt more than the United States, it is a very serious consideration. But there is a more important consideration which we have not touched upon. There is a point which every member of this House and every man in the country should seriously consider, and that is that the United States, since 1878, the period at which hon. gentlemen opposite took office in this Dominion, have reduced their indebtedness \$425,676,968.96, while the Government opposite has increased the debt of this country to \$80,384,030.14, while the debt of the United States is going down from year to year the debt of Canada is yearly increasing. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the question of cities. The hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster) labored very hard to show his friends in St. John that it was no use in their going to the United States for the purpose of getting rid of municipal indebtedness and heavy taxation. He told them that if they went from St. John to Bangor they would leave a city that only had \$36 of municipal debt per head and go to one that had \$157 and some odd cents per head of municipal indebtedness. Well, Sir, I took occasion to look over the statistics of the United States, and I find that in the year 1880 there were in the United States 268 cities with a total population of 11,327,648, and a gross debt of \$580,516,140, or a *per capita* debt of \$51.54. Now I believe the *per capita* debt of Toronto is something like \$64 per head. We have not very accurate data upon which to base a calculation as to the exact municipal indebtedness of our towns and cities; I am sorry to say our census does not give us the data upon which to make a correct calculation. But as I said before, the hon. member, when his friend left St. John, wanted to send him to Bangor. Why send him to Bangor? Because, Bangor was heavily taxed. He had evidently searched the statistics of the United States to find a heavily taxed city, and so the hon. member sends his friend to Bangor instead of to any other city with a less indebtedness. I find, Sir, that there are 63 cities in the United States with a *per capita* debt under \$10; there are 108 cities with a *per capita* debt under \$20; there are 47 cities with a *per capita* over \$60, and 22 with a *per capita* debt of over \$40. But the hon. gentleman does not send his friend from St. John to any of those places. Oh no, he sends him to Bangor, and Bangor is one of the heaviest taxed cities in the United States. There is only one other city the municipal debt of which per head exceeds that of Bangor. Well, I suppose he thought he would send him to the worst place. He did like the evil spirit in the "Pilgrim's Progress;" he made up his mind that he would keep his friend as long as he could in the city of St. John, and when his friend was determined to go he sent him the wrong road, in the very opposite direction that he wanted to go. Now, Sir, I will give you the municipal indebtedness of some of the cities of the United States:

	Population.	Rate per capita.
Amsterdam, N.Y.	\$ 95
Akron, Ohio	1 07
Bloomington, Ill.	17,000	12 89
Burlington, Iowa	20,000	6 58
Baltimore, Ind.	332,000	2 57
Bradford, Penn.	10,000	0 00
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	10,000	4 04
Newport, R.I.	15,000	7 42
Quincy, Mass.	10,500	6 24