

I might go on further, but the above will be sufficient samples. Secondly, his excuse is the House has voted these sums and payments. Well,

THE MINISTRY IS RESPONSIBLE

for this, and further, it was the duty of the Treasurer to warn the House, and when we offered motions of want of confidence and of warning to the extravagances the Treasurer was not only silent, but voted in favor of these expenditures. Further, the Treasurer and the Government were, to use strong language, but applicable, obtaining money under false pretences. Has not the Treasurer in holding figures showing surpluses each year led his party to believe there were ample funds for all these expenditures? Why, sir, what did the Treasurer say in his last Budget speech on the 21st February, 1890, not ten months ago. I will give his own words:

"If, on the one hand, the services just enumerated (and he has been alluding to some items of general expenditure) have cost us more, no one, I am sure, will attempt to blame us for having increased for objects so useful and so necessary to the province the expenses of those services, and, on the other, we have succeeded by a wise and firm administration in finding the means to meet the requirements of our policy."

And again, in the conclusion of his speech, he adds:

"As for the financial situation I think I can safely assert, without fear of serious contradiction, that it is infinitely superior to what it was when we came into power. With our present resources we have succeeded in covering past deficits, meeting the increase in the interest service, providing for unavoidable expenses and in showing a respectable surplus. This is certainly the best proof that our exertions have not been unsuccessful."

On the same evening after Mr. Desjardins had exposed the Treasurer's figures and openly stated they were wrong, and that notwithstanding the increased revenue the figures showed enormous deficits, a floating debt of about six million dollars in round numbers, and that a loan was necessary, what did the Premier say. Let me give you his words also. After alluding to the railway subsidies he says:—

"We have paid a fourth or fifth of these subsidies without borrowing a cent; we have paid \$400,000 to the Jesuits; we have paid \$100,000 for the construction of iron bridges; we have paid the \$50,000 for seed grain; we have paid all these sums, which you know of, and yet these gentlemen have the audacity to tell you that we are leading the country to bankruptcy. * * * * And he (Mr. Desjardins) asserts with infallible knowledge that the treasury is empty and we must borrow. Well, Mr. Speaker, let him say so; the province of Quebec is not the less in a prosperous

state and the treasury in excellent condition."

Now, sir, how can we characterize these declarations and statements made, not on the hustings, but from the responsible places of the Premier and Treasurer in the House. They must have known the true situation, and the Treasurer has just told us. In less than four years he has a floating indebtedness of \$6,700,000

WITH NOT A CENT TO PAY IT,

nor any asset to pay it. For 1890 our ordinary expenses were \$800,000 more than in 1886, taking Mr. Shebyn's own classification of the accounts.

The Treasurer's statement shows for years of 1889-90 a deficit of \$551,963, or that amount more paid out than received from the ordinary revenue of the year, and his estimates show for the current year a larger deficit. And all this has taken place during these years when he received as special sums—\$100,000—for education from Ontario, which should have been invested but has gone into the ordinary cost; \$556,000 arrears of tax on commercial corporations; \$125,000 in settlement of a debt for prisoners from the city of Montreal; \$150,000 from the proceeds of two sales of Crown lands, or a total of \$931,000, and also annually each year in revenue \$125,000 from the commercial corporations; \$150,000 increased dues from ground rents and timber dues, and from \$40,000 to, during the last two years, \$130,000 increase from licenses. The expenditure can be taken from the Treasurer's own figures and classification:—

1885-1886—Ordinary	\$3,088,163
Special	1,052,903
Total	\$4,141,066
1886-1887—Ordinary	\$3,289,697
Special	1,608,917
Total	\$4,798,615
1887-1888—Ordinary	\$3,365,082
Special	2,851,710
Total	\$6,216,793
1888-1889—Ordinary	\$3,543,618
Special	1,580,518
Total	\$5,124,136
1889-1890—Ordinary	\$3,839,839
Special	1,473,967
Total	\$5,312,907
ESTIMATED BY THE TREASURER.	
1890-1891—Ordinary	\$3,425,945
Special	1,452,183
Total	\$4,877,828