

of Canada, during the last three years, than during the five years that my friends opposite were in power. I have the figures here, and I will give you the data on which they are made up. There were collected from Customs, Excise and Stamps, in 1874-75, \$20,664,878.96; in 1875-76, \$18,614,415.02; in 1876-77, \$17,697,924.82; in 1877-78, \$17,841,938.19; in 1878-79, \$18,476,613.35; making a total of \$93,295,770.34. The deficits during the five years were \$5,491,269.51. If the deficits had been collected and added to the sums above, it would have amounted to \$98,787,039.85. The average for the five years was \$19,757,407.97. The average population for this period being 4,050,674, the per capita tax during that period was \$4.88 per head. These are the figures and these are the results. There were collected, from Customs, Excise and Stamps, in 1879-80, \$18,479,576.44; for 1880-81, \$23,942,138.95, making a total of \$42,421,715.39. Deducting the surplus for the two years, \$2,589,515.36, leaves \$39,832,200.03. The average for the two years of taxation was \$19,916,100.01, being, on a population of 4,282,360, \$4.65 per head during the last two years, as against \$4.88 during the other period. Now, Sir, it may be said but you collected more. We admit it; we collected \$2,900,000 in the two years more than was required for the expenditure. That was the surplus for the two years, and having been used in the reduction of the debt, diminished our taxation for all time to come. If any hon. gentleman on the opposite side should object to this it should not be the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), because, in a speech he made in the West not long since, he justified the collection from the people during the hard times of less than was required, and he said it was a proper thing to collect less because, when the times became better, they would collect more to make it up, and that is exactly what we have been doing. It is a very common thing to state—I have heard it stated in my own presence by a gentleman whom I am happy to see present, that the expenditure of the country has enormously increased within the last two or three years. I have shown that the taxation has not increased, because we require 23 cents per head less than before. But, of course, the expenditure has increased. How could it be otherwise? If we compare the average expenditure of 1874-79 and 1880-81, with the average expenditure for the five years previous—we find that our average annual expenditure—is \$1,229,372 in excess of the average annual expenditure of our predecessors. I admit that fact; there is no denying it. It is a matter of record, and I do not wish to deny it. But what becomes necessary to do now is, to show how this increased annual expenditure of \$1,229,372 was incurred, to compare the expenditure of the previous years with that of the last two years, and show that the present Government has been more economical than its predecessors by at least \$1,000,000 per year. Now, what do we find? We find that, from the 1st July, 1874, to the 1st July, 1879, the expenditure was \$119,679,284, or an average of \$23,935,856 per annum. From the 1st July, 1879, to the 1st July, 1881, the expenditure was \$50,356,866, or an average annual expenditure of \$25,178,443, the difference in their favor being, as I have already stated, \$1,229,372. And for what purposes were these expenditures made? In the first place, we find, that in 1879-80 and 1880-81, we worked an average of 401 miles of railway more than hon. gentlemen opposite worked when they were in office. These 401 miles of railway involved an expenditure of \$802,000 in excess of the expenditure for the like service performed by our predecessors.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where were these 401 miles of railway?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have the figures from a return furnished me by the Department of Railways showing that 401 miles were worked during 1881, over and above

the average worked by hon. gentlemen opposite. These figures are furnished in a return from the Department giving the different roads, and I am satisfied it is reliable. I will give the figures in detail if hon. gentlemen want them. The average amount of interest paid on the debt during 1879-80 and 1880-81, was \$7,648,006, against an average interest paid by our predecessors in 1874-75 of \$6,806,507, making an increase in the average payment of interest during the two years to which I refer, since the present Government came into power, of \$87,499. The increase in the sinking fund during the same period, over the average paid by hon. gentlemen opposite, was \$353,457. This was a practical reduction of debt by that amount. Then take the average increase of expenditure for Indians, and for the management of lands in the North-West, as compared with the expenditure for these services from 1874 to 1879, and we find that we have added, on account of these items, the sum of \$235,042. Take next the exceptional appropriations made by Parliament last year, averaging \$58,500, for the relief of the sufferers by fires in Hull and Quebec, and the relief of our Irish fellow-countrymen, and the increased expenditure for the Census over their average, amounting to \$56,079, and we have the following result—an increased expenditure altogether of \$2,382,617, which hon. gentlemen opposite were not called upon to make, against an average increase of \$1,229,372, or a difference of \$1,153,245 in favor of the present Administration. If I add to that the \$190,000 expended in the establishment of post offices in the North-West and British Columbia, and in the Post Office service generally, for which we have added nothing to the taxation of the people—because the difference between receipts and expenditure in the Post Office is less during the last two years—it would amount to \$1,343,000. We have, then, an answer to the question which has been asked by the leader of the Opposition, how it was that in a speech I made in August, 1878, I stated that I believed that \$22,500,000 would have been sufficient to pay the expenditures of the country during the five years the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power? If you deduct the amount I have mentioned from their average expenditure during the five years of their Administration—of \$23,900,000—we have just about \$22,500,000. In other words, deducting those expenditures, it will be seen that I was justified in making the statement to which the hon. gentleman alluded, because it is on that basis that we are carrying on the business of the country to-day. It is just as well that the whole truth should be known in reference to this matter, and while we, on both sides of the House, may be addressing public meetings, in different parts of the country, we may not often have the opportunity of meeting each other face to face as we do here in Parliament. It gave me great satisfaction to have my hon. friend opposite on the platform with me in West Northumberland, and I felt it an advantage—considering the position we occupy with reference to the financial position and the expenditure of the country—to have my opponent within reach, where he could make his statement, and I mine, and then leave the country, or those who were present, to decide who was right and who was wrong. It is desirable that we should meet our constituents and the people generally on all suitable occasions, but it is not always convenient for both parties to be present at the same time. Sometimes there is not sufficient time in an afternoon, and I admit that sometimes it is difficult to arrange that both sides should be heard on the same evening; and again, previous engagements may prevent; but, at the same time, it would be more satisfactory to the people who listen to those statements if they could hear, on the same occasion, the statements made by both parties—the one in opposition to the Government and the other in its defence. But here, we have