

so that the amount should not seem so much larger at first, to provide last year, as he should have provided, for the parliamentary session which we are at present holding, like an ostrich hiding its head in the sand and thinking its body does not obtrude. Everybody knew that that money must necessarily be expended this year. In the parliamentary history of Canada such a thing has never before been done: it was called to his attention, but he did not estimate for it. That amount has to be added. An estimate of \$39,698,925 was brought down. This year my hon. friend has brought down an estimate for \$38,111,663. But my hon. friend has not brought down any Supplementary Estimates whatever yet, and in order to show a saving in the Estimates, he compares the amount brought down, not taking into account any Supplementary Estimates, which will be a large amount, with the previous estimate submitted by himself, and the hon. gentleman attempts to show that the Government are making a saving.

But the point of contest is not as to what saving the hon. gentleman will make next year as compared with himself during the present year, but it is as to what saving this party is going to make as compared with the party that has gone out of power. That is where the contest lies. And it will be found that for the current year there will be added to the \$39,698,925 by way of Supplementary Estimates certainly half a million, three-quarters of a million or one million of dollars—certainly half a million must come down—and I think the estimate for the current year will exceed \$40,000,000.

The hon. gentleman may say, we will not spend it all. If he does not—and I do not suppose he will spend it all—he cannot save so large a margin as to save himself and his hon. friends from this position, that the Liberal party, through its leader and responsible advisers, declared they would cut down the expenditure by one, two or three or four millions of dollars, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite are going to incur an expenditure which will be at least \$2,000,000 in excess of the expenditure during the last year of the Liberal-Conservative party's administration. I will not follow the hon. gentleman into the details of this estimate, because it is impossible to do so satisfactorily until the Supplementary Estimates are down, and they are not before the House at the present time.

If hon. gentlemen will take the expenditure from 1887 to 1896, a period of ten years, under the head of consolidated revenue fund, they will find that the expenditure of the Liberal-Conservative Government averaged \$36,850,000, and last year's expenditure was \$36,950,000. So that the Liberal-Conservatives' record of expenditure is this: That in ten years the average has been \$36,850,000, and during the last year of their administration the expenditure was within that average up to a paltry sum of fifty thou-

sand or sixty thousand dollars. On capital account, the average expenditure of the Liberal-Conservative party was \$3,639,427, and in 1895-96 it was only \$3,781,311, or about the average, and one million of that amount was due to an extraordinary expenditure on militia, which if it had not been incurred, would have left the ordinary expenditure on capital account at about \$2,700,000, or \$1,000,000 less than the average for the years from 1887 to 1896. That is the record of our expenditure.

What will hon. gentlemen opposite probably expend? The Finance Minister has submitted for the current year an estimate of \$39,698,925. To that estimate he will add about \$800,000 by Supplementary Estimates yet to be brought down, and that will make the total Estimates in round figures, \$40,500,000, or \$2,700,000 in excess of the Estimates for 1895-96. For next year the hon. gentleman estimates the expenditure at \$38,111,663 without any Supplementary Estimates. I think the hon. gentleman will find before he gets through that he will have to ask for \$1,900,000 in Supplementary Estimates, which, added to the amount I have stated, will make a total estimate of \$40,000,000, which will be \$2,200,000 over the estimate of which I spoke a moment ago. When the hon. gentleman comes to capital expenditure he will find that whereas our estimate was \$3,936,220 for 1896-97, his estimate already down is \$4,528,469, and adding about \$200,000 in Supplementary Estimates, will give a total \$4,750,000 on capital account before the current year is through. For 1897-98 hon. gentlemen opposite have already on the Table of the House Estimates for \$6,386,696, which I venture to say will be raised to \$7,000,000 when the supplementaries are brought down. What do we find? The estimates on capital account for 1896-97 are \$800,000 higher than 1895-96, and for 1897-98 \$4,000,000 higher than that. Adding consolidated fund and capital together will give on my calculations, an estimated expenditure for 1896-97 of \$44,000,000; and for 1897-98 of \$45,500,000. Take off the usual percentage for lapsed balances, and these gentlemen are going to expend on both these branches, from \$42,000,000 to \$44,000,000 per year, against \$40,000,000 which we spent in 1895-96.

In the light of those facts, am I correct or not in stating, that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), his pamphlets, and his speakers, and his platform, have not carried out the faith they pledged to the honest electorate when they led them to believe by actual English words, made as strong as the English language could put them that if the party of the Conservatives were turned out and the party of the Liberals were put in, the expenditure would drop by one, two, three or four millions per year.

Well, Sir, have they kept their pledge with reference to taxation? With reference to taxation, they led this country to believe