

them for extravagance were not justified at the time, and that these outcries against their predecessors were for political ends. It is true the revenue of the country is flourishing, but I may remark that there are many respects in which the country stood on a higher plane in former years than at present. Where is the shipping that was owned throughout every one of the maritime provinces twenty or thirty years ago? We have no such fine ships on the register of those provinces now as we had in those days. That is one evidence of the flourishing state of trade at that period. It is true we have a very large importation now. Our imports have swollen enormously, I might say, in some respects; but have our exports kept pace with the imports? They have not. The result will be that in a few years this country will have to be trying to collect money in every possible way in order to send it abroad to pay for the large amount of goods imported, with our exports falling so much short of the amount of our imports. We all remember how a few years ago the maritime provinces were referred to as the "shreds and patches" of the Dominion. It is true that epithet was hurled against us at the time when we returned a Conservative government to power. Since then they have changed and returned a Liberal majority, and the "shreds and patches" are now being bound together by wharfs in every corner of some of these provinces, where they were formerly erected by the people, and were the means of earning a livelihood from the business at these wharfs. Now, the government have stepped in and are building wharfs in places where it never was the intention of the government up to the present time to build wharfs. They are also, under the measure which we have before us, erecting public buildings in various places throughout the country where the revenue derived from those places is not sufficient to justify such expenditure as is provided for under this bill. These expenditures increase largely the amount which we are voting for the public service. Many items which are within the bill are justifiable and liberal sums for the improvements of the country, but I maintain that outside of those there are a great many appropriations which are not justified by the circumstances of the country, or by anything except, possibly, the necessity of the representatives of the places at which

these expenditures are to be made. At the late period of the session at which the appropriation bills come in, it is impossible for members of the Senate—perhaps it may not be altogether their duty—to criticise or examine all the various items of which the Supply Bill is composed; but at the same time, we may speak in a general way of the different appropriations which are made and which, without the approval of the members of the Senate, would not have the sanction of law. I consider that the appropriations are more liberal than the circumstances of the country justify. The Senate is not responsible for the amount of that expenditure. The members of the other branch of Parliament who have passed these items, and discussed each appropriation in the Supply Bill, will be the men who will have to justify the course that they have taken before the country.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—Although I said the other day that I was opposed to our practice of carrying the estimates three times around the table and saying amen, and that I would have something to say about them this time, I shall not occupy the attention of the House for any length of time on the present occasion. This session of Parliament has been a most extraordinary one. The people of this country will think and say so. There is an increase of expenditure in every department of the public service. The government have increased every expenditure in the public service.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—Excepting the indemnity.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—Well, they increased the indemnity to themselves, but they forget the members of the House of Commons and the Senate. They increased the salaries of ministers of the Crown, and the legislation is retroactive. I do not think the hon. gentleman from Glengarry was here at the time. He was away on business, but if he had been here he would not have had occasion to put that question to me. If we were to go over the Supply Bill item by item and compare it with the pledges which the members of the government made to the people of the country, it would take a month, and it would be difficult to accomplish it in that time. I listened to the remarks of the Minister of Justice. His party said at one time that it meant ruin to five millions of people to spend thirty-eight millions a year,