

quite convinced, if the Liberal party came into power, that if the people would change the complexions of its rulers, they could reduce the annual expenditure by four to five million dollars. I never heard him say a word about that during the five years he was in parliament supporting the present government. But if it were so, then the expenditure should have been last year about \$36,872,318, instead of \$61,500,000; it was only about one hundred per cent greater than his calculations in 1895. The following figures will show how the expenditure has increased during Liberal rule:—

1893—Conservatives.. . . .	\$40,853,727
1894—Conservatives.. . . .	43,008,233
1895—Conservatives.. . . .	42,872,338
1896—Conservatives.. . . .	41,702,383
1897—Liberals.. . . .	42,972,755
1898—Liberals.. . . .	45,384,281
1899—Liberals.. . . .	51,542,635
1901—Total vote.. . . .	61,500,000

We have not had a single word said about that. It is rather a ticklish subject, no doubt, for the two hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House, more particularly when considered in view of the professions of the hon. gentlemen when they were in Opposition. Allow me for a few moments to call attention to the position which these gentlemen occupy as ministers of the Crown. I fancy if men like Robert Baldwin and Lafontaine could rise up from the grave and see the manner in which this country is governed to-day under the principle of responsible government, they would hide their heads in shame, and say that they no longer belonged to such a party. There never has been in the existence of a government in Canada, or in Europe, a conglomerate such as that which composes the present government. Is there a single question upon which there is a unity of sentiment or feeling among them? We have the free trader, Mr. Fielding, on one side; we have the professed free trader, Mr. Sifton, as his coadjutor. Then we have Mr. Tarte, who boasts he was born a protectionist, and educated a protectionist, is a protectionist still and intends to adhere to it, and when they discuss these questions they, the latter gentleman says, 'quarrel like blazes.' That is not my language; it is his that I am quoting.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Not like traitors!

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No, not like traitors. We might draw inferences

from the remarks made by the hon. gentleman, but we are not discussing traitors just now, we are only discussing questions of difference between the gentleman whom he admires so much—the Minister of Public Works, his beau ideal of a statesman, as a man, and as a diplomat—and his colleagues, and consequently we will confine ourselves to this instead of discussing the question of traitors. Unfortunately there are traitors in all camps, and I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman may find some among his own friends. Whether they will have the same effect as certain other traitors have, or whether the results will follow their connection with them in the future, remains to be seen. I hope it may, that's all. I have heard, particularly during the last contest in these by-elections, the admirers of the administration say: 'We have carried out all our pledges that we made prior to the elections or during the elections. There is not a pledge which we have made that we have not adhered to strictly.' They say, too we have only a revenue tariff. They say more than that. They are not protectionists, except some portion of them. Let us look at a few of them and see what a position they occupy. The Premier—and when I use the single number understand it means the whole, because the memo, I have in my hand is written in the singular—we find that when the late Alex. Mackenzie, who was Premier of the government and a man of a stern character, a man who held opinions that he was neither ashamed of nor did he hesitate to avow them, that he, rather than yield to the clamour at that time, because such it was for protection, went to the people and was defeated, and they all stuck to him like bricks. They were all free traders at that time. Mr. Blake declared that if he came into power he would not think of removing protection suddenly. The hon. gentleman will remember that famous speech of his at Malvern, in Ontario. They echoed the same sentiment, and when Sir Richard Cartwright styled protection legalized robbery and was for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, though Mr. Blake averred at that time that it would lead to annexation, they all fell into line and advocated it. Now they say they do not require either one or the other, and they have gone so far as to deny that they