

forgive him. The honorable gentleman, no doubt, recalls the fact that this Government, bound by the constitutional principles under which we live, felt it their duty when they came into power, to carry out the Independence of Parliament Act, an Act the spirit of which the late Government set entirely at defiance. We know that one distinguished gentleman from the Lower Provinces who sat in the other Chamber, held a position of importance, with a very handsome salary attached to it, for codifying the laws. The Opposition protested over and over again, but the majority at the back of the Government sustained them in keeping him until a judgeship was found for him on the Pacific slope. Another gentleman from the neighborhood of Simcoe enjoyed a very fat office, with a salary of about \$4,000 a year, as commissioner on an important public work; and, if my memory serves me right, there was another commissioner in another branch of the Legislature who also held a similar fat office, with the same emoluments, contrary to the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act, and contrary to the established usage of the country. From motives of economy, and because it was a blot on the constitution of the country, the Administration found it necessary to remove that honorable gentleman; and this accounts for the spite and venom of the honorable gentleman's remarks on the Administration. He told us in very eloquent language that under the administration of his friends, when Sir John Macdonald was at the helm of State, all was prosperity; that the trade of this country ran up, up, up, until it was fifty millions of dollars in excess of what it is to-day. It is quite true that it did; but did the honorable gentleman tell us where the difference comes in, between that excess of fifty millions of dollars and the trade of the past year? I have in my hands an extract from the Public Accounts, in the preface of which the honorable gentleman will find the exports and the imports for every year from 1868 down to 1876. It is quite true that the exports rose from \$57,567,888 in 1868 to \$60,474,781 in 1869; to \$73,573,490 in 1870; to \$74,173,168 in 1871; to \$82,693,663 in 1872; to \$89,789,922 in 1873, which was the highest point they touched since Confederation, the imports in that year being \$123,011,281. The imports had run up to that figure from \$73,459,644 in 1868. There was in 1873 an excess of nearly fifty millions of imports over exports. Though our imports were fifty millions of dollars in excess of our exports in 1873, does the honorable gentleman tell me, or tell the intelligent people of this country, that that was a mark

of our prosperity, or that the people who are in receipt of eighty-nine millions of dollars can afford to spend one hundred and twenty-eight millions? If he does he is producing a rare theory on finance, and his views will be rapidly taken up by bankrupt establishments and by countries that are falling behind their usual trade.

Hon. Mr. READ—Is not the honorable gentleman making a mistake? Is it not thirty-eight millions or forty millions, instead of fifty millions?

Hon. Mr. MILLER—It does not matter; ten millions is a mere trifle.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It does not matter; I will give the honorable gentleman the benefit of the ten millions, if I have made a mistake in calculation, but it does not weaken the force of my argument at all. It simply shows that the people of this country were spending a great deal more in 1873 than they were justified in doing. In 1874 the exports began to drop, not very much, but still they began to drop. In 1876 the exports had gone up something over that of 1875, the exports of '75 being \$77,886,979, while the exports of 1876 were \$80,966,435, an increase of a little over \$3,000,000, while the import, dropped from \$123,070,283, in 1875, down to \$93,210,346, the duty being \$12,823,114 as compared with \$15,361,332 the previous year, and that accounted for the deficiency in the revenue. Yet the honorable gentleman tells us that that is an evidence of the serious condition of the affairs of this country to our disadvantage. It is an evidence that we are coming back to live within our means, and that we are beginning, now, to be more economical, and that we are preserving and conserving the expenditure of the country. The statement is full of thought. I think that statement alone, with one other circumstance to which I would draw the attention of this House, will go far to explain what has caused the depression in this country. The true theory, in my estimation, is, that for several years we were over importing, and in addition to that there were other figures which the honorable gentleman could have quoted with advantage for this House, and which would go far to confirm that view. It is this: That in the report of the Depression Committee there is attached a very important summary, entitled a statement of assignment made by insolvents in the Dominion of Canada, from January 1875 to February 1876, a period of nearly fourteen months. In found numbers the amount of liabilities was twenty-six millions of dollars. Of that no less an amount than sixteen millions was due by persons who were in