

Baring Brothers financial agents of Canada, in England, without power of revocation. So that, if any charge is made against the financial agents, in London, in connection with the loans floated by the late hon. Finance Minister, we have a complete answer in the fact that these men stand so high in the good opinion of the present Government, that they have been appointed our financial agents for ten years. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) has indulged in some very chaste and polished phrases, in the speech just concluded. I jotted down just a few of them, to which I will call his attention, though, perhaps, they were uttered in haste. In referring to the member for Centre Huron, he spoke of his conduct as almost exceeding that of "human effrontery." In alluding to the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), he spoke of the "incendiary position" which that hon. gentleman occupied. I think we have had enough of such language from the member for East York, and I will therefore dismiss the hon. gentleman from further consideration; I know any reference made to him is unnecessary. The position in which he stands, in the estimation of members on both sides of the House, does not even call for the reference I have made; but I thought it necessary thus to allude to him in brief. We have entered upon a very important discussion. The question before the House at present is, practically, shall the policy of the present Administration, in regard to the financial affairs of this country and its fiscal policy be sustained. The hon. Finance Minister explained, the other night, his Budget at great length. He spoke of our revenues and expenditures, and was followed later by the hon. Minister of Railways, who also discussed at considerable length a number of questions, to a few of which I will refer. First, he charged the member for Centre Huron with bringing down estimates in 1874 for \$4,000,000 more than the largest expenditure of the late Government. The hon. Minister of Finance will remember that by the obligations which he had incurred in 1873, instead of bringing down an estimate for \$20,900,000 he should have brought down an estimate for \$23,368,000. He will also remember that the ex-Minister of Finance, in the expenditure for 1873-74, kept within the estimate of his predecessor, and that the present Minister of Finance, exceeded the estimate of his predecessor. He will remember that, in that estimate of 1873-74, we had to provide for the very heavy obligations which were undertaken by our predecessors; we had the Intercolonial Railway in course of construction; we had the enlargement of the canals on hand; we had the obligations incurred in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, heavy obligations which it was necessary to meet in order to maintain the credit of the country. The hon. Minister of Railways, in dealing with the expenditure of this country, touched the question very gingerly. It will be within the recollection of many members of this House, how vigorously the hon. Minister of Railways denounced the expenditure of the previous Administration in 1878, how he took up item after item of our Estimates and charged us with extravagance, because, in some instances, there were increases. I will make a short quotation from his speech delivered on the 22nd February, 1878, when he said:

"Inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power, all we ask is, not that the taxation shall be increased, because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future."

This was the platform upon which the hon. Minister of Railways went to the country in 1878, and I was not surprised that, when he came to discuss the Estimates of his colleague, a few evenings ago, he touched the items of expenditure so gingerly. We had before us his promise,

made in 1878, and we had the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance in the city of St. John, when he declared that he believed \$22,500,000 were all that would be necessary with which to carry on the affairs of this country. I am not surprised, then, that when the hon. gentleman came to deal with the expenditure, he touched the matter so very carefully; and, if we just revert to the facts of this increased expenditure, this position will be made very clear. Let us look, first, at the entire expenditure, as contained in the Public Accounts during the last few years, and compare them with the expenditure of the last Administration, and with the Estimates proposed for 1882-83. The hon. Minister of Finance delights this Session in averages, not only averages in the matter of expenditure, but in the matter of trade. I will give him a few averages in the matter of expenditure. If the hon. gentleman will notice the expenditure for the Dominion of Canada, he will find that the average during the last two years of the last Administration, was \$23,511,229, and that the average expenditure of his own Administration during the last two years, was \$25,176,594, or an excess in the last two years over our average expenditure of \$1,665,365, or an excess over our last year of nearly \$2,000,000. Now, we can understand, from that simple fact, why the hon. Minister of Railways was so careful, in discussing the public finances, not to touch on the expenditure of this country. No doubt when he looked at the Estimates he was completely appalled, for these Estimates proposed, when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, as indicated by the Minister of Finance, an expenditure of \$27,600,000, or an expenditure of \$4,000,000 over the highest expenditure of the late Reform Administration. We pointed out in 1878 that during the first seven years of Confederation the Conservative party increased the expenditure \$10,000,000. They were upon the stool of repentance during the five years they sat in the cold shades of Opposition, and nobody suffered more during that time than my distinguished friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb). While in that position they promised reform, they cried *peccavi*. Place us in power again and we will reform the finances of this country, we will reduce the expenditure. From every platform, as well as from their places in this House, they declared loud and strong their allegiance to economy and to a careful financial management. Circumstances placed them in power, and we see now how much their promises were worth. From an expenditure of about \$23,500,000, such as we required in 1878, the expenditure of this country has leaped up to \$27,600,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for this increase. Let us go into detail. The hon. Minister of Finance boasts that he was able to reduce the interest account, I think, something like \$50,000 or \$59,000. He boasts of that as an astounding feat of financial ability. The interests of this country now are in very safe keeping, because we have paid this year \$59,000 less for interest than we paid the previous year. How did he accomplish this feat of financial ability? Was it by negotiating a favorable loan in the English market? Was it by raising the credit of this country until it exceeds the credit of the other British colonies? No; not at all, but because he was able to buy up a few 6 per cents. and substitute 5 per cents. in their places. He had not to go to the English markets to negotiate a loan; he had the money in the Post Office Savings Bank, and he used that money, and all there is to boast of in this financial feat is that he saves \$59,000. But let us look at the averages, for that is a favorite doctrine of my hon. friend, and it is a new doctrine, a new plank in the Conservative platform. This doctrine of averages simply proves that the hon. gentlemen opposite required on an average, during the last two years, \$760,981 more for interest than was required during the late Reform Administration. They required \$750,000 to be drawn annually from the pockets of the people to meet public expenditure more than the