

is serious financial distress in the United States, or a prolonged period of distress there, a similar distress, generally equally prolonged, is almost certain to follow in Canada. I shall not repeat the statement which my hon. friend read of the professions of the Minister of Finance. They are fresh in the memory of the House. I have no doubt the House recollects quite distinctly the excellent advice which the hon. gentleman gave to his colleagues and to the House. Sir, there is a frightful contrast, I am sorry to say, between the profession and practice of that hon. gentleman. Before the House rose last session, the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well, it was patent on the face of the returns laid on the Table, that a deficit of over one million dollars was a certain and fixed fact. What did the hon. gentleman do? What did this preacher of economy do? What did this hon. gentleman, who thought it was the first duty of a Government to curtail expenditure so as to meet the deficiency in the revenue, do in the way of making provision for an ascertained deficit of a million and a quarter? His first proceeding was to throw away half a million of dollars. One quarter of a million for the purpose of conciliating the liquor interests, and another quarter of a million for the purpose of conciliating, what I may call, without offence to the Minister of Justice, the Tupper interest, and a very unprofitable investment is appears to have been, according to the last electoral returns. Then after effecting needless loss of half a million dollars of revenue in the face of a deficit of a million and a quarter, the hon. gentleman proceeded by statute to add one million dollars a year in all to our fixed charges, in the shape of an Atlantic subsidy of \$750,000, and of subsidies to railways involving a total expenditure of four or five millions more. Finally, and by way, I suppose, of an appropriate finish and wind up, the hon. gentleman, this advocate of economy, brought down further Supplementary Estimates to the tune of \$1,300,000. These are the precautions taken to secure economy, this is the way the hon. gentleman carried out in practice the economy he professed. Let the House compare these facts with the statement which my hon. friend read. Now, the hon. gentleman is confronted, and he knows he is confronted with a huge deficit. Let us know the facts. I have observed with some amusement the desperate contortions and evasions made on the part of the hon. gentleman's organs to escape the pressure of this deficit. I have observed something more. Newspaper correspondents and newspaper editors are not supposed to be very well versed in the mysteries of the Finance Department, and, according to the Minister of Justice they could not always be relied upon, even if they were. But, Sir, what shall we say

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

when we find in the last copy of the "Official Gazette" a statement like this: Revenue and expenditure on account of consolidated fund; expenditure to the end of 31st March, 1895, \$24,553,000; revenue at the end of 31st March, 1895, \$23,844,000; surplus, \$708,107. I beg to state to the House that I believe this is the first time since confederation that the word "surplus" has ever been inserted, or this line ever appeared in the Public Gazette at this date. What does it mean? Why was it inserted? There were four bye-elections—of course that is a matter of detail—about to come off a few days after this first appeared. But what does the hon. gentleman mean by it? Here is the official statement of the department that on 31st March, 1895, there was a surplus of \$708,107. If that means anything, if that has been inserted for a purpose, I am sorry to say I can conceive of no purpose except the purpose of confusing the minds of the people at large, and creating an absolutely false impression as to the real state of the case. It is true, no doubt, that the audited expenditure, certified by the Finance Department up to 31st March, 1895, may only show what is stated here, a total expenditure of \$23,844,000 as against a total receipt of \$24,553,000. But every man who knows anything at all of the Department of Finance or of the way in which our national book-keeping is managed, knows perfectly well that from the nature of the case a very large portion of the expenditure which has actually been incurred and which is payable at that moment is not included in these statements of expenditure and that in the later months of the year this is never entered in the public accounts until some few weeks after the termination of the financial year; and that therefore, although this may be a correct statement as regards the audited expenditure, yet this statement which I hold in my hand is most unquestionably a very false statement, as to impression which any ordinary reader will take from it on seeing for the first time in twenty-seven years a declaration that there was such and such a surplus in favour of the Government on the 31st of March. Now, Sir, I am going to show the House what the real state of the facts are, and I challenge the hon. Minister to contradict these facts. I desire the attention of the House because this is a grave matter. If I am wrong I desire to be corrected, and if I am right, I desire that every member of this House should bear in mind what it means, that to-day, after nine months receipts are in, after nine months audited expenditure, so-called is in, so far from having a surplus of \$708,000, we have to-day, as I will presently show, an ascertained deficit of \$5,016,000 on the transactions of these nine months. I do not think that the hon.