be able to carry on public affairs without increasing the expenditure beyond the next year's Estimates. Yet we find that hon. gentlemen opposite, having control of the expenditures, exceeded the Estimates by $1,676,650. How was that excess made up? In Civil Government, for instance, hon. gentlemen opposite spent $150,226 more than had been voted by Parliament; and when I tell the House that in the one item of contingencies they spent $75,000 more in that year than the Government had estimated would be necessary, and had taken the authority of Parliament to expend, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me in the statement that that was a reckless expenditure on their part. Then in the Administration of Justice they spent $78,776 more than Parliament had voted. For Legislation they spent $354,970 more than Parliament had voted. It is quite true there was a general election which was not anticipated when the Estimates were brought down, and they are perhaps entitled to say that they could not have anticipated that expenditure. But we were told when that Government came into power, and especially as a reason for the entrance of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) into the Government, in violation of the principle which he himself had laid down, that the number of the Executive Council should not be increased beyond that which the law specified, even in cases where an hon. gentleman entered without salary, that 119 members of the House, which is a good working majority, had requested the hon. gentleman to enter the Cabinet, and had given him assurances of support if he did so. With 119 members supporting the Government in a House of 206, I may fairly say that they were not bound to have a general election. Having regard to what occurred at that time, they had no intention of having a general election until they began to see, looking at what they might be requested to do during the five years they would be in office, that it would be better to secure, if possible, a larger majority while the influence of that great slander, usually called the Pacific Scandal, was upon the country. Then I find that for the collection of Customs they expended $56,062 more than Parliament voted; and in the collection of Public Works revenue they spent $319,034 more than was voted. For Post Office revenue collection they expended $71,270 more than voted; so that in these items alone, and which it must be admitted were controllable expenditures and within the competency of the Government, within certain limits of course, to regulate, they expended $730,338 more than had been voted by the preceding Administration. I am aware that it may be said, in relation to the years 1878-79, that the Government which is now in office expended also more money than had been voted by their predecessors; but we may fairly account for that from the fact that during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in office their financial administration was very severely criticised by the press and public men of this country; and on the eve of going to the country and as a preparation for the elections, their Estimates were so framed as to give the appearance, at any rate, of the greatest possible economy. Although that was the fact, what was the real result? The Conservative Government spent $758,508 more than their predecessors had obtained the authority of Parliament to spend; and of that for the collection of public works alone, largely connected with the work of the Intercolonial Railway, there was $414,714; while, Sir, the Liberal Government had expended $1,676,650 more than the Conservative Parliament had voted. Now, let us take some contrasts. Under Civil Government hon. gentlemen opposite spent $150,226 more than their predecessors had voted; the Conservatives when they came in spent $27,804 less than their predecessors had voted. Under the head of Administration of Justice the Liberal Government spent $78,776 more than their predecessors had estimated; the Conservatives when they came into office expended $36,734 less than their predecessors had provided. On Weights and Measures, the Conservatives spent $25,296 less than had been voted by Parliament for that service. In the collection of Customs duties the Liberals expended $56,062 more than their predecessors had voted, while the Conservatives only expended $13,875 more. In the collection of Post Office revenues the Liberals had expended $71,270 more than their predecessors had voted, the Conservatives only exceeded the amount by $17,423. In Legislation the Liberals expended $354,970 more, while the Conservatives only spent $58,071 more. I have said enough to show that the only true course in making a comparison of the two Administrations is to take the last complete year of each Administration of the results of which there can be no doubt as to where the responsibility rests. Doing so, what do we find? We have been told, if I mistake not, by the hon. gentleman from West Durham, in a speech which he made out of session, that the increased expenditure during the five years of Mr. Mackenzie's Government was only $200,000; and referreing to a remark made by the First Minister in a speech at Toronto, that the Liberals when in office were like soldiers marking time, moving but making no progress, he said that was true with reference to the expenditures of the country, because they had succeeded in carrying on the Government during these five years, and at the end of that period found themselves spending only $200,000 more than their predecessors had spent. Now the ordinary expenditure—what in Public Accounts is put down as ordinary expenditure—in 1872-73 was $7,062,095, and in 1877-78, $6,542,510, an apparent decrease of $519,585. But in dealing with questions of controllable expenditure it seems to me that we must always include the charges upon revenue. There is not after all any part of the expenditure, except perhaps Public Works, Militia and large items of that kind, which is more within the control of the Government of the day than are those expenditures connected with the collection of revenue. If we add these items we find the controllable expenditure of 1872-73 was $10,457,570, while, in 1877-78, it was $11,843,634, or an increase in the aggregate of these two classes of expenditure of $1,386,064. But, Sir, let us look at this decrease in "ordinary expenditure" and see how it is made up. Well, we find in the item of Militia and Defence a decrease of $630,527. We all know how that was effected. The country corps were cut off from their drill; and if hon. gentlemen opposite had simply wiped out the Militia altogether, as I believe some of them would desire to do, they could have made a much larger reduction than that. They could have presented a much more taking aggregate to the people. Then we find in the matter of Public Works expenditure, such as improvements in harbors, putting up public buildings, and other works of that kind, there was a decrease of $599,017. In that case, also, all they had to do was simply not to spend a dollar on harbors or public buildings, and stop all public works; they could thus have saved very much, and they could have made a much better show in the aggregate figures. Then I find in connection with the expenditures on Dominion lands, there was a decrease of $150,048; they had only to stop sending out surveyors, to stop everything in connection with the development of the North-West, in order to make the decrease very much larger and thus present a better picture. But in these three items alone, which I will not admit were economies, which were simply a starving of the public service—in these three items alone—the decrease was $1,379,592, or $800,000 more than the entire aggregate decrease of which they are in the habit of boasting so much. Now, while this is the case as to these items, what do we find as to others in connection with which economies might have been practiced? In the matter of Civil Government, which they tell us we have been much too extravagant in administering, during their five years of office, they increased