

to judge of the condition of trade and business. The House will remember the position of the country two years ago, when borne down with deficits, and in such a condition that the hon. gentleman opposite confessed he knew of no means of getting more revenue. He declared to this House that he knew of no means of reducing the expenses of the Government—that he had reduced them to the lowest limit, and pared down the expenditure everywhere. If the hon. gentleman had not been summarily dismissed from office by an indignant public and constituency, he would have had to face a deficit of between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 on the 1st day of July last. What had he to offer to the people? Denunciations of the means my hon. friend the Finance Minister proposed to the House, by which at the same time the public credit could be maintained, and the industries and business of the people promoted in such a way as to cause the sun of prosperity again to shine on Canada—that sun that had been for five years under a dark, impenetrable cloud. What happened? The hon. gentlemen opposite knew perfectly well that, that policy having been adopted, it was challenged in this House, first, on the ground which my hon. friend has shown to be utterly untenable and unworthy of consideration. They also said, “Even if you do get the revenue wanted, you will get it at too severe a cost; you are going to exasperate Great Britain, and make it impossible for any Finance Minister to go to its money market and borrow what we want, in order to carry on the public works of the country except at most ruinous rates.” My hon. friend (Sir Samuel L. Tilley) has given his answer; he stands here to-night with five hundred and fifty thousand arguments that cannot be answered by any statement to be found in that forest of rhetoric without an acorn of thought, in which the late Finance Minister for two hours and a half wandered. No rhetoric can wipe out the fact that the hon. the Finance Minister went to England under very unfavourable auspices, after hon. gentlemen opposite had been unpatriotic enough to endeavour to arouse feeling against their own country, after they had sent columns of communications to the leading English papers to show that Canada was

not only ruined by its Tariff policy, but that we should be unable to meet our obligations under it; he went after the press of those hon. gentlemen had been degraded to the low, unpatriotic and despicable purpose of decrying our own country for party purposes, and, worse than all, confronted by the fact that the late Finance Minister had accumulated over \$8,000,000 of deficits in four years. But my hon. friend told the financial men of England that the people of Canada had not only hurled from power those gentlemen who had proved so utterly incapable, but had restored a party to power with an overwhelming majority, who had recommended the adoption of a policy of imposing such taxation as would give the new Government the means of meeting the demands upon the Treasury. The result was that my hon. friend came back with \$550,000 more in his pocket for a three million four per cent. loan than the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) was ever able to obtain. Thus was swept away the story of the failure of our credit. If there is any faith to be placed in the statement of that hon. gentleman (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), nothing was so disastrous to Canada as the series of deficits described, and especially in the hands of the man who, in the face of Parliament, declared that he knew of no further resource but direct taxation. Does he forget that, when the motion was made in the House, with reference to home-grown tobacco, he answered it with the statement that it would take \$500,000 of the revenue from him, and that he knew of no means of replacing it but by direct taxation? I ask this House and country to put side by side that statement and the fact that, if he had been in power, he would have had to meet between three and four million dollars of a deficit on the 1st July last. He knows that the Government of which he was a member shrank from direct taxation, so distasteful to the people of this country, and yet, according to them, this was the only mode left them of discharging their obligations. The hon. gentleman said that they were not responsible for the liabilities my hon. friend was called upon to meet. Did they intend to leave the road from Thunder Bay to Red River with a gap of 185 miles.