

squandered by an extravagant Administration for political purposes. I was challenged, and my statements were scouted; yet, two years later, the hon. gentleman came down and reduced the expenditure \$600,000. And, having reduced it \$600,00, he congratulated the country that the administration of that department was better than it had ever been. Then he came down and defied us to cut down our general expenditure another dollar. Yet to-day he proposes to cut down the expenditure \$1,600,000 for the coming year. He told us it was not possible to cut down the expenditure one dollar on the Intercolonial, and he cut it down \$600,000. Then, he said that it was not possible to cut down the expenditure of the general service, and the Finance Minister proposes to cut it down \$1,600,000. What reliance can we place on the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite when they make statements of that kind?

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to trouble you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The trouble is the hon. gentleman has not gone far enough in the right direction, but I will tell the hon. gentleman that I am satisfied with the statements made by my hon. friend from Winnipeg as to the extent to which reductions can be made in the public expenditure without injury to the public service. What did that hon. gentleman show? He showed that the expenditure of 1894 had increased \$14,000,000 over that of 1878. He showed that the increase of population in that period was only 22 per cent, which might justify an increase of \$5,000,000 in expenditure. That would make a justifiable increase of expenditure in 1894 over 1878, of \$5,000,000. Suppose we throw in another five million for expenditure fastened on the country in the shape of interest and charges imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and which we cannot get rid of. Suppose we throw in five million dollars more, and allow an increase in proportion to the increase of the population. There is still a saving of \$4,000,000 which a good economical, strong Government—strong in its support by the people—could and will effect. I do not think that is an extravagant sum. I believe that saving can be effected, and if we come into office we shall do it. How does the hon. gentleman stand to-day? I remember his casting sneers across the House at the fact that, owing to the depreciation in the value of goods, there was not sufficient money raised by the Mackenzie Administration to meet expenditures, and there was, consequently a deficit for several years. That deficit was a terrible thing, but the burden of their plaint has now changed. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that a deficit is not a thing to condemn a financier for, unless it is caused by extravagant expenditure. In what position does the hon. Finance Minister stand to-day? \$1,250,000 deficit last year; \$4,500,000 this year, \$3,000,000 next

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

year; following each other in rapid succession.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you get your \$3,000,000?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will show the hon. gentleman. He levies \$1,800,000 increased taxation to meet an anticipated deficit of \$3,000,000, and then he hopes that the balance will be made up by betterment of trade. Suppose his hopes are not realized. What then? We will have a deficit of \$1,250,000 next year, notwithstanding the additional taxation of \$1,800,000 which he is going to impose upon the people. Sir, the chickens are coming home to roost; the hon. gentleman has learned that when there is a depression, the Finance Minister ought not to be held responsible for the decreased revenue resulting from customs ad valorem duties. He never was the man, though, to say that, to my hon. friend regarding his period of administration. The facts then were as the facts are now, but to these is superadded the extravagant expenditure to which the hon. gentleman has succeeded and which will never be reduced until another party comes into power. For this I condemn the Government.

I say further that they have developed administrative negligence besides. I was going to say official corruption. Yes, I will say official corruption—corruption in the highest places. Why, Sir, we have had here but a few years since a scandal at the very mention of which every Canadian had to hang his head in shame. Is there a man here who walked through the streets of London during the time of the investigation into the Langevin-McGreevy-Connolly scandal who did not feel the shame of it as a Canadian? Is there a man here who read in the English newspapers that out of four millions of dollars spent in contracts in Canada about one million dollars was stolen, who feels any pride in the fact that, though the case was probed to the bottom and those who were responsible shown up to the public gaze, to this day no man has been punished unless you except the farce of six weeks imprisonment which was awarded to two of the minor culprits? Why, Sir, the thing is disgraceful in the extreme. And have they improved? Where is the Langevin block scandal to-day? Has that been investigated; have those who were responsible for criminal expenditure of public money been punished? No, not even the first step has been taken. Where is the Caron-Ross-Beemer scandal? In this case \$25,000 was personally paid to a member of the cabinet who, in his turn, advises the giving of railway subsidies to the corporation from which he derived the \$25,000. Is that gentleman morally more guilty than the rest? No; for every man of them endorsed his action, every man of them voted to support his action as politically and morally right. He