

have lost this word economy; they cannot find it in their vocabulary to-day, and consequently they do not make the old assurance to parliament that the estimates are prepared with due regard to economy. In fact it is just as well that they did not put in that word, because from what we know of the hon. gentlemen we have no hope that there will be any evidence of economy in anything that comes from their hands. I turned to some figures with regard to the expenditure during the first eight months of the present year, and they tell the same story, as we have been reading in these returns for years back—increased revenue and an almost corresponding increase of expenditure. That is what is going on during the current year just as in previous years, and this government show no tendency or disposition to economize in the management of public affairs. I would say this to them—possibly they will not be very thankful for advice given from this side of the House—that they will be overtaken one day. The Finance Minister spoke of the crest of the wave a year ago, showing that he had himself some feeling that that point had been almost if not altogether reached. At all events it is not unsafe to say that the crest of the wave will be reached some time, and that the buoyancy of the revenue and the general prosperity of the country, like that of every other country, will be affected by depressions world wide in their nature, and will reach us as well as other countries, and they would do well in their own interest as well as the interest of the country, if they would take in a little sail, because there is scarcely any doubt—we hope it may be a remote time—stringency will come and the system of expenditure which they have been pursuing, mortgaging the resources of the country for years to come, will prove to be a very dangerous policy and will hamper themselves, or their successors. When a more economical government come into power their difficulties will be enhanced by the obligations created by this government in the extravagant frame of mind in which they have been acting ever since they came into office.

The matter of the surplus is also referred to by gentlemen in the government on every occasion as a matter of the highest of gratification. We who have been in the public life of Canada for some years remember

very well that when a surplus occurred when the Liberal Conservative party were in power, we were told by leading men in this government that we had no right to have a surplus, that we were robbing the people, taking money from them which was not needed for the public service, and consequently were pursuing a bad course. We were told that we should only tax the people for the public necessity and when the revenues exceeded that, the tax should be reduced. Now, I have been turning back within the last few days to remarks made on the subject of taxation and I find that Sir Richard Cartwright, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce speaking about twenty years ago, laid down this proposition :—

Now, I admit that abstract propositions cannot always be depended on. But I say that in matters financial you can almost with safety lay down this proposition: that whenever, without war or some other extraordinary cause, like that, you find the taxes of a country increasing very rapidly; increasing out of all proportion of its population, you can rest assured, that the government has been grossly extravagant, and in all probability grossly corrupt. And when you find the taxation remain stationary for a term of years, you may feel equally assured that the government has been honestly and economically conducted.

Now, in line with the proposition so confidently laid down by Sir Richard Cartwright, let me point to the taxation of the people of Canada during the six years the present government has been in power, and compare it with the taxation of the people of Canada during the last ten years of the Conservative administration. Taking the latter it was :—

TAXES.	
1887....	\$ 28,687,001 93
1888....	28,177,413 18
1889....	30,613,522 51
1890....	31,587,071 73
1891....	30,314,151 15
1892....	28,446,157 31
1893....	29,321,367 42
1894....	27,579,203 09
1895....	25,446,198 71
1896....	27,759,285 42
	287,931,372 45
Average for 10 years ..	\$ 28,793,137 25

It was barely \$100,000 greater in the last year of the ten than it was in 1887. Now, I turn to the six years during which the present government, and for which we have the figures, have been in power and I find the following :—