

public prosperity. If the receipts increase, the expenses must increase. The two go together, because, apart from the fact that to produce more we must spend more, it would not be wise not to take advantage of the increase of the receipts to further and more surely develop the public resources.

Moreover, the pretended increase of the expenses is much less than is asserted by our adversaries, and, to ascertain its amount properly, we should not do as our adversaries have done: Confound the ordinary with the extraordinary expenses, the revenue with the capital expenses.

EXTRAORDINARY EXPENDITURE.

The ordinary expenses of the year 1889 were \$3,543,618.64, (page 7 of Hon. Mr. Shehyn's same speech), and the payments of all sorts were, for the same year, \$5,124,136.79, the difference of \$1,580,518.15 representing the extraordinary expenditure, such, for instance, as the loan to the Protestant Insane Asylum, at Montreal, \$15,000, plus \$7,821, part of the proceeds of the sale of the Leduc farm, \$125,729 for the construction of the new Parliament Buildings at Quebec; \$42,733 construction of the Quebec Court House; \$50,000 for the enlargement of the Montreal Court House; \$20,324 for the Codification of the Laws; \$10,000 for explorations in Dorchester and other counties; \$10,000 for compensation for errors in surveys in Rouville; \$50,000 for iron bridges in municipalities; \$50,000 for seed grain; \$1,049,847 (over a million,) for subsidies to railways, &c., &c.

Is there a reasonable man in the Province who blames this extra expenditure? No that I know of. The Opposition themselves approved of it because they could not do otherwise, as these \$1,049,847, paid in railway subsidies, were so paid as the result, as far as three-fourths are concerned, of their own policy. How can they blame us for that expenditure. It was they who decreed it by voting the railway subsidies' law.

GOOD LAWS.

But, for argument sake, let us admit that the expenses are too high; then it is only right to endeavor to ascertain the reason. What is that reason? We have stated it so often that it should be needless to repeat it. In the first place, the business has considerably increased; the creation of a Ministry of Agriculture and of that of President of the Council; the augmentation of the cost of the administration of justice; the adoption of a special system to better secure the collection of the revenue of the Crown lands and other departments, &c. All these matters have been discussed and judged. The Opposition pretend that we did wrong in creating a special ministry of agriculture and colonization, and, consequently, in placing additional burthens on the public. We are not of the same opinion, and it is for the people to decide between us in the last instance.

ABOLITION OF THE SPECIAL MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

If the verdict, which the people are called upon to render at the forthcoming elections, be against the Ministry, we shall bow with respect to their decision and retire; but then, our adversaries will be obliged to abolish the department intended to favor the interests of agriculture and colonization. And the farmers and settlers, who constitute the immense majority of the country, will be deprived of a special representative in the Ministry.

RESULTS OBTAINED.

Moreover, cannot the people of this Province, in view of the results obtained, pardon us a few additional expenses? Will they refuse to take into account the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates question to the satisfaction of all the interested parties? Will they refuse to allow for the establishment of the night schools? Will they refuse to take account of our iron bridge policy? Will they refuse to make allowance for our efforts to macadamize the turnpike roads and to abolish toll-bridges and toll-gates?

Will the people be satisfied to only examine our expenses, without giving any heed to our receipts? Will they push injustice so far as to look only at the debit side of the sheet