

regards the future and as regards the past. The Finance Minister told us, that in the year 1895-96 we raised, in round numbers, \$36,618,000 from our tariff and other sources of revenue, and that we spent \$36,949,000; that in 1896-97 we raised,—or will when the year has closed—we will raise, according to his calculation, \$37,300,000, and we will spend \$37,850,000. Therefore, for the first year these hon. gentlemen are in power, they have increased the expenditure, and for the second year of their regime they propose to raise \$37,500,000 and to spend \$38,250,000. Let me direct the attention of the House to this condition of things. Before these hon. gentlemen obtained power, they told the people that they were too heavily taxed, that our public expenditure was too heavy, and that if they were given the task of governing the country they would reduce, through economy, the expenditure by at least three or four million dollars. Such statements were made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Now, Sir, did the people of the country believe these statements? If they believed them and returned the Reform party to power to make retrenchments, then the people were sadly deceived because the Liberals have not reduced the expenditure, and they do not propose to reduce it. The hon. Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us a few nights ago, that in the very nature of things it could not be expected that the expenditure would be very much reduced, and that for some years it would be in the neighbourhood of from \$38,000,000 to \$40,000,000 a year. Sir, the people have been promised economy by this Government, and they must be disappointed now when they find that there is to be no decrease in the taxation.

On the other hand, the Liberals before they attained power, claimed that we were raising more money from the people than we should raise to carry on the affairs of the country. Well, Sir, these hon. gentlemen have had an opportunity of showing their hand, and instead of decreasing the amount raised from the people, they propose to increase it, and to spend as much as their predecessors in office did, or in fact a little more. There are two things in connection with this which attracts our attention. First, these hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, either believed that they were right or they believed that they were wrong. If they were as intelligent as men who aspire to govern a country ought to be, they should know what the necessities of the country were, and if they believed that this economy could be made and they have not made it, then they misled the people for they have not carried out their pledges, and they are unworthy of public confidence. Will they state now, that they did know

it but tried to deceive the people; or will they say, that they had not intelligence enough to know it, and they find now they were mistaken. In either case they merit the loss of the confidence of the people. Another point in connection with this matter is: The Government came to power pledged to economy, but they have not exercised that economy, or else their judgment was bad; because the expenditure under their rule is as large or larger, than it was under Conservative rule. They came to power declaring, that they would reduce taxation; but as I have shown, they propose to raise as much as their predecessors did, and consequently they cannot reduce the taxes of the people. They told us, that tariff reform was to bring about reduced taxation and destroy the protective principle. Now, the tariff reform which they have made has not destroyed the protective principle, because practically the protective principle is in the new general tariff which we must have in operation for some time. They came to power declaring that they would relieve the farmer of the onerous duties he was obliged to pay on the commodities he uses, but they have not reduced the duties on farm implements, and therefore the farmers of Canada must lose confidence in their pledges. They told us, that they were to relieve the manufacturer by giving him his raw material free, such as coal and iron. Well, the duty on coal is the same as it was before, and although they have partly reduced the duty on iron, it is not free iron by any means. Therefore, these gentlemen opposite have not kept their word in that respect. It is true they have done something for the miners of the country, and for that I commend them. They allow miners to bring in their machinery free, but in proportion as that machinery is brought in free, they strike the Canadian manufacturers; and I think the home manufacturers should have some consideration.

I come now to an analysis of the tariff that is presented to us. We have practically two tariffs in the Budget; the first which comes under schedule "A" and the second which comes under schedule "D." The first is the general tariff, and I shall refer presently to what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said that tariff is to be. Last night the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) read the declaration of the principles of the Liberal party when they would come into power, and I shall beg leave to refer to it briefly. Here is what they said they would do:

We, the Liberal party in Canada in convention assembled, declare that the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon protective principles, but upon the requirements of the country.

They say in their platform, that it should not be based upon protective principles, but the Finance Minister told us that the new