

last fiscal year, to one-tenth of one per cent, it is quite clear the reduction of taxation has not had much to do with the reduction of the revenue. If there was one thing which hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in opposition, and for many years after they had come into power, were fond of talking about, it was the deficits under the Mackenzie administration, and now, hon. gentlemen have got to come to Parliament with a deficit for the present year, which is as large as all the Mackenzie deficits taken together.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman may say no, but there are the figures. The deficit is over five millions, and it will probably be six millions by the first of July. The only remedy suggested by His Excellency's speech is economy. Now, hon. gentlemen, the intentions of the government, with respect to economy may be very good, but up to the present time, their execution has fallen short of their intentions. The government have been economical now for more than a year. I think the Finance Minister last year spoke of the necessity of economy, but they are still spending, in spite of their economy, about twelve million dollars a year more than their predecessors did. Mr. Mackenzie's administration spent in their most extravagant year a trifle over \$24,000,000, and the present administration have spent somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$37,000,000 during the past year; and it will be remembered that in those days my hon. friend from Quinté and other hon. gentlemen who thought that \$24,000,000 was a great deal too much to spend, and that the business of the country could be conducted on about \$22,000,000; and how these hon. gentlemen can now defend their expenditure of \$37,000,000 or \$38,000,000, while they are labouring under the present attack of economy, is something one cannot understand. Although this is not perhaps the time to discuss the expenditure of the country, I cannot forbear to call attention to a scheme, illustrative of this proposed economy, which has recently come to light. It has been stated in the newspapers, and I think there is good foundation for the statement that the government propose to make a grant to the Hudson Bay Railway Co. of something like two and a half million dol-

lars, which would involve a permanent charge of about \$100,000 a year, which is a great deal more than would be made up by many small economies; and the government propose to do this in the face of the fact that, in as far as evidence taken with respect to that Hudson Bay route is concerned, the weight of that evidence is altogether against the practicability of the Hudson Bay route as a means of getting out the harvests of the North-west.

Hon. Mr. PEKLEY—It is not the Hudson Bay Railway. It is a colonization road.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Well, it is called in the newspapers the Hudson Bay Railway. The government, the other day, were thinking of having a general election, and it was hinted that they were not quite as popular in the North-west as they had been, and it was supposed that the people of the North-west were in favour of this wild scheme of a railway to Hudson Bay; and the government, therefore, proposed to spend the two and a half million dollars with a view of economically securing the votes of the people of the North-west.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—The hon. gentleman does not want the government to suspend those works in progress in Halifax, because we want them very much.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I forbear to make any observation on the interruption of my hon. colleague. I shall only say that I do not think logic is the hon. gentleman's forte, and shall let it go at that. I was rather surprised that the premier, who usually appears disposed to receive courteously the suggestions of the opposition, did not show the gratitude he might have done for the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the opposition, that he should reduce the duties upon certain staple articles with a view of increasing the revenue. The hon. leader of the government actually did not seem to understand the argument of the hon. gentleman from Ottawa. The tariff of the present government is avowedly a protective tariff. If a protective tariff is successful, it shuts out importations, it prevents importation. That is what it is intended for, to exclude foreign products; and if it excludes foreign products, we get no revenue. If there are no products coming in to pay a duty, it