

a great deal of this expenditure there has been

Much Waste, Much Extravagance,

and I fear in some cases down-right positive corruption of a very grave character. What we have to consider to-night are really the consequences, not so much of these petty misdoings as of certain grave and long continued errors of policy. We have had to contend with errors in our fiscal policy, errors political and errors administrative; but although they have been of various sorts, they all, I think, may be fairly traced to one source, and that is the determination on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, at any cost, and at all hazards, without the slightest reference to the effects of their conduct on the future of this country, to maintain themselves and their friends in place and power. Now, Sir, beyond all doubt, the man who is chiefly responsible is the Prime Minister, and chiefly responsible on this ground: That, perhaps, alone of all his present Cabinet he sees clearly and understands what are likely to be the consequences of the policy he has adopted. As for his colleagues, or, perhaps, I should more fitly call them his subordinates, for colleagues in the proper sense, that hon. gentleman for a long time has had none—as for the hon. gentleman's colleagues—for I will not quarrel about a word to-night—as for those gentlemen, Sir, I think some leniency might be shown. Reviewing their conduct, I have come to the conclusion that a considerable proportion of them, at any rate, might be fairly described as having become morally and politically color blind. * * * Now, Sir, concealment of our actual position has become impossible, and we must consider what the facts are as revealed to us in the Public Accounts. It is impossible, even for the Ministry or their supporters to deny that last year they had a deficit of at least \$2,240,000. As the Minister candidly admitted about \$1,000,000 further was borrowed from 1886,

making the real deficit last year in reality \$3,240,000. But what he did not tell us was that in the capital account on the Intercolonial Railway at least \$287,000 were charged for items which have no business or place in capital account. * * * If he chose to take to his credit \$893,000 on account of Dominion lands, he should in all fairness have added \$303,000 which you will find charged to capital account for expenditure on those identical Dominion lands. Now, Sir, in point of fact, but for the expedient of borrowing from the revenue of the present year, the actual deficit for last year would have amounted to no less than \$3,900,000; and even giving him credit for the \$1,700,000 which was expended in the North-West, there would still remain a deficit of \$2,200,000 to be charged against last year. With respect to

The Deficit for the Present Year,

on the 1st March, we had a deficit of \$4,716,000. The hon. gentleman tells us that since that time a very large amount of money, some \$3,800,000, as I understood him, has been paid by anticipation of the revenue. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman and the House know quite well that if you choose to anticipate by many millions the revenues which are likely to accrue in the succeeding three or four months, the result will not be to permanently help the revenue of this year, unless, indeed, we perform—by way, I suppose, of paying 1886 for what was lost for the benefit of 1885—the still further act of robbing the revenue of 1887 for the benefit of the revenue of 1886. I am not disposed to quarrel much with the estimate the hon. gentleman has made of the expenditure for 1886, and which he put in all, if I took it down correctly, at \$38,500,000. But, Sir, I am disposed to enter a very strong protest, indeed, against the absurd and unbusiness-like idea of charging \$3,500,000 of that expenditure to capital account. What does that \$3,500,000 represent? I had always supposed that every item in capital account was