

\$30,000,000 to our debt for the Canadian Pacific Railway alone. Possibly we may get it back; possibly we may not; but at any rate there it is, an addition to the debt of Canada of \$30,000,000. How many millions more is the hon. gentleman going to add before these resolutions of which he has given notice are put through the House? How many millions more for the additional provincial debt? How many more for the various railway subsidies which are alluded to? I am not including the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has all to be paid within the next two years if the work goes on as fast as he supposes; but, taking those alone, we would find that practically to-day the hon. gentleman has increased our debt \$60,000,000 instead of \$15,000,000. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that a reasonable increase cannot be complained of, but my hon. friend gave full credit for that. My hon. friend's position—and it was a fair position—is this that the increase at present is not a reasonable increase, that the increase is an inordinate increase; that, when you find Estimates brought down like those the hon. gentleman laid on the Table the other day, which show an increase over the actual expenditure of 1878 of nearly \$8,500,000 per annum, we say that is not a fair or reasonable or proper increase; that, make what allowance you like for the additional sums received for public works and for the additional sum received for post office, both of which are fair and reasonable enough—although I might remind him that there was an increase on that score of \$600,000 in our time as well as in his—let him allow as he pleases for that, still there remains an exceedingly large and an exceedingly unreasonable increase. These excuses are the invariable excuses which are always made by spendthrift Governments and spendthrift individuals whenever their extravagance is brought before their notice. You never yet found a spendthrift debtor who was not willing to explain to his creditors that, although he had spent more than he ought to have done, it was not possible for him to live becomingly or conduct the necessary improvements in his business or in his house or in his style of living for anything less. I will for a few moments call the attention of the House to a point which has possibly not attracted as much attention as it deserves. Here in Canada, no matter what the hon. gentleman may say, we are not a very large country or a very rich country. I hope we may soon become one, but I know that this system of taxation which exhausts to such an extent the resources of the people is not the way to make us rich and prosperous. We began moderately enough. For the sake of argument I leave out of sight altogether everything except the amount collected for Excise and the amount collected for Customs, and the amount collected during a portion of the time for Bill Stamps, and I would just call the attention of the House to this simple fact, that in the 16 years which elapsed from 1867 to 1883 we have paid in actual taxation, under these two heads of Excise and Customs \$307,150,000 as per these Public Accounts, that in 1884 we are going to pay \$26,000,000 more, so that this poor and young country in 17 years has been obliged to pay \$333,150,000 in hard cash in taxes. And, as it is perfectly well known to everybody who has studied the subject, that the exaction of those taxes involves a very large further addition to the amount taken out of the public pocket, even in cases where the utmost possible pains are used to ensure that the taxation, be it much or be it little, shall take as little as possible out of the pocket of the people more than goes into the Treasury, you would find that in all human probability not less than \$420,000,000 have been taken in taxes out of the people of Canada in that interval. Now, I have put, all through this discussion—and I was glad to see that my hon. friend did—entirely on one side all disputed questions of policy as between Free Trade and Protection; but I say every hon. gentleman who

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

knows anything of the mode in which public expenditure has increased, and who chooses to compare it with that of other countries, either old or new, under similar circumstances, must agree with me, if he gives the subject one moment's reflection, that our financial position is becoming a serious one. What we warned hon. gentlemen of in the early part of this Session has happened. They have carried their point, but they know best at what cost. They know perfectly well that such another victory as they obtained, when they induced an unwilling House to sanction an advance of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, would be another name for ruin. These hon. gentlemen object to comparisons made with the United States or to comparisons made with England. My friend beside me is right in saying that you cannot escape or elude comparison with the United States. Every man in Canada, every man who comes to Canada, will of necessity compare our position with that of the United States; and it is a very grave subject for reflection that, as I showed, and the figures were not disputed, because they could not be disputed, our position as regards that of the United States has become enormously worse within the last few years. But, lest the hon. gentleman should say that the position of the United States is peculiar, and that therefore we should not make a comparison with it, I will take two other countries in Europe, of almost similar population to our own, one a very rich country, another a country which compares in many respects very closely to Canada; and I will call the attention of the House and of the country to the position in which those countries are financially as compared with Canada. And first of all, I take the Kingdom of Sweden—not Norway, which is a very poor country, but Sweden—which compares very closely as regards a large part of its territory with ourselves. The population of Sweden, according to the last statistics was 4,565,000 souls. The total expenditure in Sweden, according to the estimates for the last year, amounted to £1,374,000 sterling, including some extraordinary expenses for railways, including a vote for army and navy of \$1,250,000; so the total expenditure per head—in Sweden was considerably less than \$4.50, and this may be very well compared with our own total expenditure, because in Sweden they have also, as probably the hon. gentleman knows, been engaged in constructing a great number of railways at the public cost. The Swedish railway system is now about as large or nearly as large as our own, and has been constructed under circumstances of considerable difficulty, through rocky and mountainous regions in many places. You find, whereas we had an expenditure to our population of something like \$7.25—a gross expenditure—the gross expenditure of Sweden was barely \$4.50, and it will not do for the hon. gentleman to say that Sweden is not a fair example. Sweden, in many respects, is in a very good position, has a very fair trade, and a trade, too, largely similar to our own trade in many respects. Or, if he objects to Sweden, let me take the case of Belgium. Belgium had a population of 5,500,000; the actual revenue of Belgium, excluding the amount received from public works, they being a large owner of railways, and I believe of vessels also, amounted to £7,160,000 sterling; their total expenditure, deducting the same amount, was £8,000,000 sterling; they had to pay for their army alone \$9,000,000 a year, having to maintain by reason of their position a rather considerable army. I will deduct our public works, which amount to \$3,000,000; we have then an expenditure similar to the Belgian expenditure, of \$29,000,000 a year, as by the present Estimates. So, Sir, that it follows we are spending to-day nearly twice as much as Sweden is spending per head on her population, and we are spending a little more, apparently than Belgium, which, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, is one of the