

Then it was necessary for the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to have his hat pressed, and so he charges the country \$1.25 on that account. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that his wine bill was pretty large that week, and although I cannot say as to whether there was any connection between the hat pressing and the large wine bill, yet it is rather singular that it was necessary to get his hat pressed at the expense of the Canadian people by reason of the alleged wine bill. Then we have a charge of \$3.80 for flowers, and \$1.25 for cabmen. The next week there is a similar charge for seven days' board at \$20 per day—\$140; extra meals, wines, and cigars, \$14.50; laundry, \$3.75; and livery, \$1.50. So it is through his whole account, and I say that it is outrageous that our money should be squandered in such a manner for this exhibition. I would like to know what his constituents in Centre Toronto think of their member, living in Chicago at \$20 a day and \$5 a day for wines, liquors and cigars, besides having all his expenses paid. Yet the hon. member (Mr. Cockburn) had the audacity to tell this House that he had spent \$3,000 of his own money in connection with that exhibition. I do not see how it was possible for him to spend any more money than he has charged up to the country. The amounts are all very large, and the Government are to blame for allowing the bills to run up in that way. If a proper supervision had been made of those accounts, and if they had been properly audited, it is my opinion that a very large saving would have been made to the tax-payers. You will find, Sir, that the greatest extravagance prevails in every department of this Government. It was stated here by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Baint) in reference to the Department of Railways and Canals, although we have a Minister of Railways drawing \$8,000 a year, a chief engineer drawing \$6,000 a year, and with all the clerks and engineers necessary to conduct the affairs of that department, yet within one hundred miles of the city of Ottawa, a little work that should have cost \$150,000 or \$175,000 has cost the people of this country nearly \$400,000. If, in any ordinary business concern in this country the man conducting it allowed such a waste as that, he would soon get his discharge. It is no excuse for the Minister of Railways and Canals to say, that he did not know that this work was going on. It was his business to know, and the people of this country are paying him to see that the works under his administration are properly looked after, and that the treasury is properly protected. If you follow up the contracts that have been let, and the Government work that has been done throughout the country, you will find that there has not been a single public building erected during the last ten or fifteen years in connection with which there has not been a large

Mr. CAMPBELL.

amount of extras charged. Right in front of this House we see the Langevin block, which should have been built for \$450,000, but already we have paid \$800,000 in round numbers for it, and Mr. Charlebois, the contractor, has still a claim against it for nearly \$200,000. I have no doubt that that claim would have been paid by the Government if it had not been for the investigations which took place here in 1891. The other day we were told by one of the Ministers that there is a claim for \$17,000 extras in connection with a public building in Toronto, the drill hall, and no doubt before the matter is settled, that claim will be swelled up to probably to \$25,000 or \$30,000. The Finance Minister has admitted to the House this session that last year we had a deficit of \$1,200,000; that on the 30th June of this year we will have a further deficit of four and a half millions, and probably a deficit for next year of \$1,700,000. Seeing this sad condition of affairs, and seeing that in the last fifteen years our expenditure has piled up by leaps and bounds, until it is now \$40,000,000 a year, let me ask what is the proper course, in view of this deplorable state of things, for any prudent business man to take. Would he not first try and reduce his expenditure so as to bring it within his income. Instead of doing that, the Finance Minister takes an opposite course, and he goes to work to levy taxes and to increase the burdens on the people of the country. We find that the fact that the duty was to be increased on sugar was conveyed by a friendly hint to the wholesalers, the friends of the Government throughout the country. Read the Ottawa "Citizen," of 6th May last, an organ that is the mouthpiece of the Government here, and what does that paper say. In its issue of 6th May, speaking of Hamilton, it says:

The wholesale grocers in Hamilton are well pleased with the advance in the sugar duties, and say the Government could not have selected better articles to increase the duties on than it did, as the changes will not be felt by the consumers. Nearly all the wholesale grocers had received a hint that the duty on sugar would be raised, and all had a large stock on hand.

Now, I say, if that statement is true, it is a most scandalous thing for the Government of the day—

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to state before this House that a hint was given by the Government to wholesale dealers or grocers?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have given you the statement of your mouthpiece in this city.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to give it as his opinion, and I would like to know if it is his opinion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No. I state what your mouthpiece, the Ottawa "Citizen," said.