

Does the hon. gentleman suppose that in the Province of Ontario, at any rate, there are no municipal taxes to be paid; that there are no heavy taxes in our cities to be paid?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Nothing like in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He does not know practically the expenses which are inflicted on the holders of property in a very large number of the towns, villages and cities of Ontario. I know well that the municipal administration of the United States, is a blot on their system, that the people are plundered in many of the cities of the United States; and I know that we in Canada are not so much behindhand. I know that in Canada the burdens of the people are in many places very heavy, and that they are very largely caused by the same evils of administration which prevail in certain parts of the United States, though not in all. Although it may not be true of all the Provinces, it is true, at any rate, of the chief Province, that taking an average State of the Union, not one particular State selected by the hon. gentleman, but an average State, you will find Ontario is paying in proportion just as much for those purposes and in some cases more, as the hon. gentleman will see if he will make the comparison, than many of the States of the Union. There are isolated cities where such a state of things as that to which he alludes prevails, but they are only isolated and not a fair average in the United States in general. He said another thing to which I will call the attention of the House. He stated we incurred no additional debt by assuming the provincial debt. That is a very great fallacy and a very great mistake. When he chooses to relieve a Province by assuming its debts, as the hon. gentleman has done once and is going to do twice, I can tell him that he will remove from the Provinces every kind of inducement to the exercise of a wise and wholesome economy; he will teach them the worst lesson they can be taught. The whole of this system of subsidising the Provinces was known to be a weak spot, an unfortunate expedient, necessary and unavoidable perhaps; but if the hon. gentleman will look at the original debates which took place in Parliament, he will see that many of us who knew the risk warned the Government that it was likely to bring the Provinces again and again to apply to the Dominion Exchequer, that it was likely to remove all wholesome restraint and tend in a very great degree to extravagance, corruption and mismanagement in the conduct of Provincial affairs. What is more, of these taxes more comes from the public than goes into the Treasury. I am not speaking of the hon. gentleman's financial system, I am not speaking of a protective Tariff; I waive that, but the hon. gentleman knows that every tax which brings a dollar into the Public Treasury takes, at the very least, \$1.25 out of the pockets of the people; and it is by no means true, for that reason alone, that it is a mere shifting of the burden when we assume the Provincial debts at the cost of the general public. The hon. gentleman asks why we did not reduce expenditure in 1873? We did reduce it and very largely. Let him take the book laid on the Table of the House by himself a few weeks ago, and he will see that the reduction amounted to a reduction of \$1,500,000 in controllable expenditure alone during that period. If he wants to know why we did not reduce the other expenditures, I will tell him. The hon. gentleman then, as now, had committed the country to enormous contingent liabilities. Then, as now, he had undertaken to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway on most unduly onerous terms to the people, against the protest of every member of the Administration that afterwards succeeded him; he had engaged in very large commitments for canals; he had begun and we had to finish the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman's memory is gravely at fault when he says that the works on the Welland and Lachine Canals

were not commenced before my hon. friend took office. My hon. friend found that contracts had been actually commenced and that work was done in both those cases. Was that not the case?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend says, "yes," and his memory is seldom at fault in those matters. It was not possible for us, nor for any Government coming in, especially under such circumstances, to break off hastily the policy to which the country has been committed. As my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) truly said, the successors of any Administration are, to a very great extent, bound, of necessity, to carry out the policy their predecessors had actually inaugurated and to which the public faith was pledged. For that very reason, much as we disapproved the conduct of hon. gentlemen in committing Canada to the task of building the Canadian Pacific Railway during the next ten years, we were bound to go on with the absolutely necessary portions of that obligation. It was impossible to delay opening up the North-West, and I always held that to be the bounden duty of my hon. friend. He did it in the teeth of obliquy and in the teeth of the attacks brought against him by some of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman; and if he had not done it, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that not for many years to come would it have been possible to have had a railway through Canadian territory to the North-West. He cannot therefore hold him responsible for the expenditure on the Intercolonial, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the canal system. That was so, at any rate, as regards the Welland and Lachine Canals, which are the two works on which the vast bulk of this \$19,000,000 was expended. When he charges us with having had deficits, all I can say is this, that had our advice been taken, had our warnings been attended to, had the cautions we gave borne fruit, as they ought to have done, there would have been no deficits, no difficulties. Those deficits and difficulties were produced through the fault of the former Parliament of Canada in undertaking works too great for the strength of the people, and by just such steps as the hon. gentleman had recourse to in assuming those Provincial debts which, he says, do not add any burden to the people. Moreover as a matter of fact his contention is not quite correct. Taking the four years to which he alluded, there was no addition to the public debt through deficits. If the hon. gentleman will add together the surpluses we had in 1874 and 1875 and the sums expended for sinking funds from 1874 to 1879, he will find that in 1874-5-6-7-8 there was nothing at all added to the public debt, after having deducted the surpluses in the first two years and the amount expended in sinking funds in those five years. That is a calculation which the hon. gentleman can easily make for himself. He told us that the tax per head from 1879 to 1884 was less than from 1874 to 1879. He tells us that when we were paying \$29,500,000 in the last year on a population of 4,300,000, deducting Indians, the burden per head was less than when, with a population of 4,000,000 we were paying \$20,000,000. Let that statement go. We pay \$9,500,000 more in taxes, having an addition to our population of perhaps 200,000, although that is doubtful, and yet the hon. gentleman says the taxation is not more per head. I say nothing of the fact that the hon. gentleman under his system has taken many millions of dollars out of the pockets of the people each year than has gone into the Treasury, but I give the simple fact that with an addition of 200,000 people to our population we are paying pretty nearly \$10,000,000 more in 1883 than in 1878, and yet the hon. gentleman says the tax is less per head. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman boasts that he has only increased our debt \$15,000,000. The hon. gentleman had better wait. I think in the last few weeks we have added