

things. They are true, my hon. friend knows they are true. Now, I proceed to the analysis as to whether these pledges have been made, and whether they have been kept.

First, Sir, with reference to the expenditure of this country. Has there been a time within the last fifteen years when my hon. friend opposite, the leader of the Government has not taken his stand on the ground of condemning the party opposed to him, the then Government of the day, taken his stand upon the bed rock principle that the expenditures of the Liberal-Conservative Government were heavy, were too heavy, and ought not to increase; and that if the Liberal party came into power, they would be cut down? Can there be any dissent to that? If one gentleman on that side rises to dissent, I have simply to place before him the statement of his leader, who, in the last campaign, put the top stone upon it, in that canvass that he made through this country from one end of it to the other, in speeches that he made in the city of Toronto and in Montreal, and in two of which he made statements that I will read. But first, I will give the statement of the convention of 1893, with reference to it:

Moved by Mr. Gibbons.—We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand strict economy in the administration of the Government of the country.

Now, Sir, in Brantford, and in Toronto, the present leader of the Government, standing then for his party, the impersonation of the principles of the party, so far as it had principles, standing as the bright and special impersonation, chivalric and brave, of those principles, declared:

Do you imagine there is any justification for this extraordinary expenditure? The Conservatives tell us there is a justification. Population has increased, they say. O yes, it has increased 9 per cent, but the expenditure has increased 100 per cent. There can be no justification for such an expenditure when, as has been stated, the great bulk of it is a corrupt expenditure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew you would emphasize that with a good cheer:

Moreover, they tell us that, if we were in power, we could not retrench and economize. But I do not believe that it will be a difficult task. It would not be a very difficult task to economize to the extent of one, two, three—and Mr. Mills told his constituents, a few days ago, that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

In Toronto he said:

Has the expenditure gone down? No, it has gone up. It went up two, three, five, ten millions, and more, until it is now thirty-eight millions; and the Conservatives do not shrink from

Mr. FOSTER.

it, but swallow it all. If we come into power, we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that, although we may not be able to bring back the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three million dollars per year.

That is the statement of the impersonation of the principles of the Liberal party on the question of expenditures. And, Sir, there were good honest people, farmers, artisans, business men, all through this country, who looked up into the face of the leader of the Opposition, lauded by his followers as the chevalier sans peur et sans reproche, and said: That is what we want, that is what we want, an honest man to head an honest party, to bring down the expenditures of this country. Those were the terms of contract, the people signed the contract, it has been repudiated by the leader, and faith is outraged, and confidence is slain, and the political life of this country is degraded.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not have thieves, anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Wellington, as I understood him—he will correct me if I did not—said: We do not have thieves, anyway. He does not deny it, Mr. Speaker. He means that we had thieves on our side of the House. Let me tell him that his leader herded with thieves, took thieves' money and placed it in deposit to keep his men from being turned out at election courts; took thieves' money, knowing afterwards that it was thieves' money, allowing his party to profit by it, sitting there to-day and not making any proposition to restore it to the impoverished Quebec treasury. He slept with Pacaud, and Pacaud tolled the public contracts for his party benefit. Does my hon. friend want to know anything more about thieves? The hon. gentleman had better not appeal to time. Time passes, and time will make some revelations yet.

But, Sir, I have a political primer here, a primer of tariff reform, published in the "Prince Edward Islander," which bears the ear marks,—shall I call them,—of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is a primer of tariff reform, a primer which shows the Liberal policy, and says:

The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure without injury to the public service; Hon. David Mills estimates the probable saving at \$4,000,000, et cetera, et cetera.

Now, Sir, has this been done; has the expenditure of the country been reduced? Let us see. The estimates brought down for 1895-96, and for 1896-97, were yesterday laid before this House. The estimate brought down by my hon. friend for 1896-97, consolidated fund, was \$39,698,935. That is what has been brought down—that is not all the hon. gentleman should have brought down. My hon. friend omitted, purposely,