

charged to the current expenditure of the year. I am giving the total amount which this Parliament is asked to vote in this Supply Bill, and the Supply Bill which we have already passed, being the amount to which the country is pledged either to expend during the coming year or in the future. They amount to \$56,043,972. But that is not all. You have the railways and bridges subsidies amounting to \$6,540,293, and if you capitalize the vote of \$140,000 annually to the Grand Trunk it pledges the country to a payment of \$4,421,898. Then we have the \$60,000 that is given to assist the city of Ottawa. Deduct the \$15,000 from that, which has been paid in the past, and which has no right to be added to the demands of the present government, capitalize that for ten years and you have \$386,295. Then we have our proportion of the cost of the Pacific cable. It is true that received the support of every member of both Houses, but that does not affect the fact that we are pledged to an expenditure of \$2,361,111, or making a total for current expenses and capital account for which the country is pledged in the future the magnificent sum of \$69,753,569. I know my hon. friend, if he were to attempt to answer these figures, would say a large proportion of this is expenditures for the future. I admit that, but it does not change the fact that in one session the country is pledged to an expenditure of within a fraction of \$70,000,000. That is the manner in which the economy to which these gentlemen pledged themselves has been carried out, and it will be for them to reconcile their conduct with their professions when they appeal to those who have the power to retain them in the positions they occupy, or reject them at the polls. After the statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice, I thought it was only proper that I should place before the House and before the country the view that I, at least, and those with whom I act, take of the growing expenses of the country and the exorbitant demands made upon us, and to point out some few cases in which the appropriations are not only not unjustifiable, but I might add, criminal in their character.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)—It is not within our province to go into all the details of this bill, and if we were disposed to do so, we have not the time or the oppor-

tunity at this last hour of the session. The Minister of Justice referred to the expenditure which we are making under the bill as being justified for the improvement of the highways of commerce. If the expenditure within the four corners of this bill was legitimately confined to the improvement of the highways of commerce, it would receive no opposition whatever from the members of the Senate, but when we look at the various items which are embraced within that bill, we find there are many other items there than those which should be designated as expended for the improvement of the highways of commerce. The hon. Minister of Justice referred to the flourishing state of the revenue of this country, and I am very pleased to agree with him that the revenue of the country has been flourishing, and therefore that it, in some measure, justifies an expenditure greater, possibly, than had been made on any previous occasion; but when we look back at the record of the gentlemen now composing the majority in support of the government, and remember the statements which they made broadcast throughout the country, when the expenditure did not amount to anything like the sum that it does now—when it was \$15,000,000 or possible \$20,000,000 less than the expenditure proposed during this session—when we remember that these gentlemen called upon the people to oppose the government which then ruled in the country because they were imposing such vast taxes upon the people of the country by their extravagant expenditure; when they told the people of the country that every individual in the Dominion of Canada was taxed to the amount of forty dollars. When they told them a few years ago that the expenditure had been increased up to fifty dollars a head of the people, or \$300 for every family within the country, will it not appear evident to the country that that was the greatest clap trap, the most absurd denunciation that could be given to the people when we see these very gentlemen now, when in power, increasing the expenditure and justifying it to Parliament and to the country. Does it not show that their utterances at that time were the veriest buncombe that could be uttered? The course which the government of the day has pursued during the present session is a justification of the course pursued by former governments. It shows that the epithets which were hurled against