

facts—and I do not accuse him of being so desirous—he would have informed the House that the increase was caused by their own recklessness, by adding to the public debt \$34,000,000, making an increase in interest of \$1,521,902, and \$542,497 sinking fund, making a total of about \$2,064,381, which, if taken into account, would leave a balance in favor of Conservative rule of \$399,016. We will now take the ordinary controllable expenditure, to which he also referred. In the two years of Grit rule the amount was \$13,377,588; during the two years of Conservative rule, \$14,257,415; making a balance of \$879,827 in favor of the Grits. But from this you must deduct the item of Census, which was not an expenditure in their year, and also the excess in the expenditure of Indian Affairs. These items in their two years amounted to \$731,698, and in the two years of Conservative rule to \$1,626,944, making a difference in favor of Conservative rule on those items of about \$894,944. Deducting that from the excess of expenditure mentioned by the hon. gentleman, we have \$15,177 in favor of the Conservative Government. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen say your ordinary controllable expenditure has increased very rapidly, and no doubt it has; but I am going to prove, out of their own mouths, that that expenditure has not increased as rapidly as they anticipated, or as rapidly as they stated the country would require. I will not go back to last year's expenditure, but I will give them the benefit of quoting the Estimates for this year which are the largest. I do that for this reason: that when the hon. the leader of the Opposition went down by the seaside, to discuss the financial affairs of the nation, he would not take last year's expenditure at all, so I will follow his example, so as to put the worst possible phase on our side of the question. Now, the Estimates of 1882, are \$8,381,673, and, comparing this with the expenditure of 1875-76, we find a difference of \$188,101 in favor of that year. If you deduct from this the excess in 1882, on account of Indians and Census, you have a sum in our favor of \$682,793, which added to the other balance makes a total, in favor of 1882, of \$870,894 as compared with 1875-76. Now, take another view of the matter. The expenditures of 1874-75 were \$7,868,690, which, deducted from the Estimates of this year, leaves an excess for 1882 of \$512,983. Deduct from this the excess on account of Indians, \$813,829, and Census, \$41,628, in all \$855,437, leaving a balance in favor of 1882 of \$342,454. Let us now compare the Estimates of 1877-78 with those of 1882, and let us deduct from the Estimates of 1882, those items which did not occur in their time, or the amount of excess in 1882. These are: Indians, excess, \$187,805; Census, \$58,947; Public Works, 706,281; Immigration, \$197,616; Ocean Service, \$78,256; Militia, \$140,364; or a total of \$1,669,269, which deducted from the Estimates of this year, leaves \$6,712,404; and if from this you take the expenditures of 1877-78, you find that the difference is only \$169,894, and this in face of the fact of the great development of the country. Let us now make a comparison of the ordinary expenditure of the two Governments. This ordinary expenditure for the last three years of the Grit Government amounted to \$21,947,362, and for the last three years of this Government to \$21,134,992, leaving a balance in favor of Tory rule of \$812,374. I will now make a comparison between the expenditure of 1881 and the Estimates made by the late Finance Minister in his Budget Speech. His estimates were as follows: Legislation, \$600,000; Civil Government, \$900,000; Administration of Justice, \$900,000; Marine, \$900,000; Militia, \$1,050,000; Public Works, \$1,500,000; Immigration, \$500,000; Miscellaneous, \$150,000, or a total of \$6,500,000; while the expenditures for 1881 for the same services were \$5,534,593. I think, Sir, that when we find that this country has, during the past year, been able to carry on its affairs without visibly increasing the national debt, when we find that within the

last eight months we have been able to reduce the national debt by \$1,300,000, and that we have to our credit \$4,000,000, it is a very satisfactory exhibit. This is not money wasted; it has been paid by the people, and no person has complained of it. Can hon. gentlemen opposite give a single instance in which the people have complained of these taxes during the last year? They cannot name one. Now, Sir, some of the speakers in this debate have stated that we are indebted to the Liberal party for everything that has been a benefit to this country. That is a statement I have heard made on public platforms during the last quarter of a century, and I have failed, with all the research I could bring to bear on it, to discover what great work of public utility is entitled to be placed to the credit of the Reform party. What are they? Will some hon. gentleman name one great act of public utility which that party has placed on the Statute-book? Now, I am not going to review their past legislation, because if I attempted to do so, I would have to look at a blank. Their record is before the country—a record of extravagance and corruption, a record which shows that they were totally incapable of administering our public affairs, a record of deficits substituted for surpluses. I am not going to go over that ground, which was so well covered by the hon. member for Rouville, (Mr. Gigault), who, I think, must have satisfied every hon. member of this House in the very eloquent and logical speech which he delivered, that the Reform party can lay nothing to their credit in respect of legislation. We, on the other hand, can say that we have a happy and prosperous country, we can say that we have a happy and a contented people, we can say that our expenditure has been kept within the revenue, we can point to an overflowing Treasury, we can point to a home market for our people, we can point to our laborers and mechanics enjoying peace and prosperity, and we can point to the rapid development of the North-West, a country which will become the financial safety-valve of this Dominion. With regard to that country, I cannot do better than quote from a recent speech of the Hon. Senator Beck:

"I went to Winnipeg last summer and there saw a thriving city of 15,000 people, with a railroad about finished to Lake Superior. It was being pushed with great energy and abundant means westward to the Pacific Ocean to reach the trade of Australia, China, Japan and the Indies on English soil, with cheap ships ready to furnish free goods for transportation over this continent to Europe. I went west of Winnipeg nearly 200 miles on that road, and saw thousands and thousands of acres of wheat clearing forty bushels to the acre, weighing sixty-three and sixty-five pounds to the bushel, and was assured by undoubted authority that on Peace River, 1,200 miles north-west of where I was, wheat was being produced in immense quantity equal to the best I saw in Winnipeg, while great herds of cattle were being fed without cost on as fine grassy land as the world affords."

Now, Mr. Speaker, one hon. gentleman has stated that we were the subservient followers of the right hon. leader of the Government. Well, Sir, I admit the charge if he pleases to term an honest following subservient. I am proud to be an humble follower of that hon. gentleman. But, Sir, we can say what they cannot say—we never turned traitor to our hon. leader. In the hour of our hon. leader's greatest difficulties, the Conservative party stood shoulder to shoulder at the back of the hon. gentleman as the leader of the party; they recognized that he, of all others, was Canada's greatest statesman; and it is no reflection upon us to say, that we have followed that hon. gentleman faithfully. I take it as a compliment, and I thank the hon. gentleman for it. Sir, what are the issues before the country? The right hon. leader of the Opposition down by the sea has stated them. He says: "There are three issues before the country, and they are plain and definite—revenue and expenditure, the Tariff, and the development of our young country." Sir, on these three questions we take issue, and we have the advantage in taking issue upon them, because we can point to the rapid development of our country, to a wise and economical arrangement of our financial