the cost by $160,180. Under their rule, the cost of the Administration of Justice increased $163,954; the cost of the Post Office Department—of the collection of the Postal Revenue—increased no less than $657,206, making a total increased expenditure in those items—all controllable expenditures—of very nearly $1,000,000, viz.: $981,206. Under those circumstances can hon. gentlemen opposite, with any regard for accuracy, at any rate, say to the people of this country that, during the time they were in office and had control of the expenditures, they did anything to entitle them to claim credit for economy or retrenchment? What has been the expenditure under the present Government? I take simply the Public Accounts as my authority, because it is most inconvenient to deal with the Estimates. Last year the present Government spent half a million dollars less than they obtained the authority of Parliament to spend. Therefore, having regard to fairness and accuracy we can only deal with the actual expenditure as brought down in the Public Accounts; but from them what do we find? That the total expenditure in 1877-78, the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, was $23,503,158, and, in 1880-81, under the present Government, $25,502,554; or an increase under the present Government, in three years, of very nearly $2,000,000. How has that increase been brought about? In one matter, the charges, interest, sinking fund and on the public debt, there is an increase of $883,604. Surely the late Government were responsible for that. I think I may say that the present Government have made no expenditures on capital account, if you except the payments that may have been made on the Yale and Kamloops Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and on the contract for the missing link between Thunder Bay and Selkirk—excepting on works begun by hon. gentlemen opposite, and for which the contracts were actually let before the present Government was formed. Then they have had to expend on an exceptional item—that appears every ten years in our accounts, and which fell in since the present Government took office—viz.: the Census, $127,033; and they have also been obliged to spend in Public Works, $140,171; and on Indian grants, $383,594; Post Office, increase in the Collection of Revenue, $151,719; and on Public Works, for the collection of revenue, in consequence of the greater mileage of the Intercolonial Railway, an increased outlay of $231,727, or on all these items a total of $1,918,848. This leaves only about $80,000 of an increase on the other items of the public expenditure. Not one of those items, I venture to say, can hon. gentlemen opposite fairly challenge. They cannot challenge the increase in the interest on the public debt, and the sinking fund and charges connected with it; nor can they complain of the item for the Census, for that is a statutory obligation, and an outlay we have to incur every ten years. They will hardly complain of the increased expenditure on public works in presence of our large revenue, our overflowing Treasury, or that the wants of the country in connection with the public works are being generously and fairly dealt with. They will not object either to the increased expenditure on account of the Indians. If they do I would refer them to the admirable correspondence from the North-West, which appeared in the Toronto *Globe*, the leading organ of their party, in which the policy of the Government in making larger expenditures in the North-West, in connection with the Indians, was fully sustained and vindicated, and in which the prediction was made, which has been realized since, that very large expenditures for this purpose would be required. They can hardly complain of those expenditures to which I have referred, and, therefore, the only expenditure, taking the whole service of the country, to which any exception can be taken is this item of $80,000. If I were disposed to take up the time of the House, I could show that every single item making up that sum may be vindicated and defended on its merits. Then, I say, if we look to the great increase of the public outlay during the time the late Government were in power, and compare it with the expenditures of the present Government, we will find these remarkable facts: The expenditure on the public debt showed an average annual increase during the administration of the late Government of $478,207, while the average annual increase since the present Government was formed is but $294,535. The Post Office expenditure during the late Government showed an annual increase of $131,441; during the three years of the present Government the increase has been but $50,573, and that in spite of the fact that within the last three years that service has been extended over our great North-West, and an enormous expenditure to the country has been required by the necessity of furnishing settlers with adequate postal accommodation. Again, I find that the annual increase in the cost of collecting Customs revenue under the late Administration was $29,352; under the present Government it has been but $1,059, or about one twenty-ninth part as large as the increase of the late Administration, and that, despite the fact that there was an aggregate decrease in the Customs revenue during their term of five years of $171,341, while there has been an aggregate increase under the present Administration of $5,621,268. I find also that while the collection of the revenue increased annually during those five years, by $381,130, the annual increase during the last three years has been but $127,343. Then, Sir, while the revenue itself increased during the period of the Mackenzie Government $312,308 per annum, it has increased during the last three years, $2,420,095. The hon. gentlemen opposite, when in office, actually increased the cost of collecting the revenue by $68,822 a year more than the increase in the revenue itself. I think that may fairly be said to be pretty strong evidence that there was no great economy or carefulness in the administration of public affairs by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, I think you will agree with me, under these circumstances, that in relation to the financial administration of this Government, the hon. members of the Government themselves, and their supporters in this House, have no reason to fear any public criticism to which they may be subjected, and have no reason to fear the ordeal to which, within a short time, sooner or later, we must all submit at the hands of the people of this country. The hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of referring to the increase in the public debt. While as between the two parties it may be a matter of no great consequence whether the debt increased more during the five years one party were in power, or the six years another party were in power, or the three years that the same party have since been in power, the use which hon. gentlemen make of this increase in the public debt, is to create the impression through this country, and in other countries where it is our interest to stand well, and to which we are appealing for a share of the emigration that is going from them, that the Dominion is going headlong to ruin, that it is incurring debts beyond what its resources will fairly justify. In pursuance of this policy we are told the debt has doubled since Confederation. What are the facts? In 1867, the net debt was $75,728,641; in 1873, the debt was $99,848,461, or an increase of $24,119,820, or an average annual increase for the six years of $4,019,970. The net debt in 1878 had increased to $140,362,069, an increase in five years of $40,513,608, or an average annual increase of $8,102,721. The net debt in 1881, on the 30th July last, was $155,395,780, an increase in three years of $15,033,711, or an average annual increase of $5,011,237. Let me give hon. gentlemen those averages. Six years of Conservative rule, an average annual increase of the public debt of $4,019,970; during the five years of Liberal rule, an average annual increase of $8,102,721; three years of Conservative rule, an average annual increase of $5,011,000.