

Debts on the Estimates of Canadian Expenditure.

The most important debate of the present Session of Parliament is progressing, and in accordance with the custom we have followed heretofore, we propose to lay the utterances of Canada's leading public men before our readers, so that they may know what both sides have to say in reference to the management of public affairs.

New Brunswick Legislature.

We have quite full notes of the doings of the Local Legislature, which does not appear to have settled down to the real business of the session yet, and we, therefore, forego the publication of several columns of communications.

While the parties who asserted that the balance of trade had been particularly in favour of the United States, and against the relations existing between the two countries, the hon. gentleman dwelt some length upon his desire to sustain British connection, and was good enough to tell us it was entirely a mistake to suppose that British shippers had anything but the most friendly feeling toward the people of Canada.

Train-Wrecking.

The Moncton Times, which had laboured so long under the influence of the late Government, and which had been the scene of so many of the most successful operations of the late Government, was not afraid to withhold subsidies from that "veracious" journal.

Our Ottawa Letter.

During the past week the real business of Parliament has begun. We got the estimates on Monday, estimates framed with true Tory extravagance and providing for an expenditure ordinary account, of more than twenty five millions of dollars.

is no one thing, except the food which the farmer requires to consume, which is not and will not continue to be most heavily taxed. (Hear, hear.) And, Sir, his tariff hits these men both ways, for in addition to being heavily taxed, their charges for freight are increased both ways: the hon. gentleman added to the same time has added to the charges for the transportation of their grain, and by diminishing the former he is virtually compelling the farmer to pay the freight both ways.

As I have a vast general market than we, which of itself is away with a large amount of the mischief incidental to protection, and that they have an enormously greater range of products; and they fought also that the United States are virtually a confederation of thirty-nine or forty nations, every one of which has the most perfect system of free trade on the earth among themselves, and for that reason, one of the arguments on which the hon. gentleman's policy depends is in its essence entirely fallacious.

While the parties who asserted that the balance of trade had been particularly in favour of the United States, and against the relations existing between the two countries, the hon. gentleman dwelt some length upon his desire to sustain British connection, and was good enough to tell us it was entirely a mistake to suppose that British shippers had anything but the most friendly feeling toward the people of Canada.

Well, Sir, I hold the opinion that the Marquis of Salisbury is likely to be correct as to the feeling of the statesmen and people of England, as any information the hon. gentleman could have secured in his somewhat hurried visit to the Mother Country last year or the year before.

Shadow.

Alf in the heavens ride the sun, Flooding the world with light, In the azure depths the clouds are firing, With their light and the daylight torturing, With a forecast of coming night.

Over others, still the shadows, Hang with heavy pad, Like the shadowy shape of a mountain base, Yet never the living hand, Nor the foot of a mortal tread, Till the weary rest from the shadow land, In a eternal day.

Alf in the heavens ride the sun, On such a single ray, Can reach the earth in its somber plight, From the dark shadows of his secret night, Like the death pall on the day.

into the pockets of a favoured few; and while nobody has asserted that the hon. gentleman has put seven millions into the Treasury, what we have a series of that of the seven millions which he takes out of the pockets of the people of this country, a very small part goes into the Treasury, but the greater portion goes into the pockets of manufacturers. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has fostered some industries—the industry of smuggling, which was depressed some years ago, is rapidly reviving under the fostering influence of the hon. gentleman.

Moreover, Sir, although the hon. gentleman dwelt very lightly with this point, I am afraid he will find that his Excise duties have already resulted in a great deterioration of the market for agricultural products of the country (hear, hear), and also the adulteration of liquors through the hon. gentleman cannot regard that as a very serious evil. Now, Sir, I now observe that I think the hon. gentleman himself has—and I know his organs have—made it a matter of complaint that we had not praised him for the general rise in prices that has taken place. Although this is a curious case of exaltation, so far as the consumer is concerned, I am willing, for my part, to give the hon. gentleman the credit, which he undoubtedly deserves, for the rise in prices that has taken place in sugar, iron, bread, and fuel, and in almost all articles of prime necessity within the Dominion of Canada.

There is, no doubt, an important factor in our present prosperity, to which my friend's characteristic modesty has prevented him from making more than a passing allusion, but which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. It is, that we all know that he was good enough to make a progress through the country in order to see how well the policy was promoting the welfare of the people. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I desire to say that I entirely repudiate the view taken by some wicked editors, who likened the hon. Minister to a commercial traveller who had filled his customers' orders and returned for further instructions. (Renewed laughter.)

It is on record that in former times, the good old times of the Irish Church establishment, a certain prelate of that Church set out on a progress through his extensive diocese, mainly, I believe, with the view of ascertaining what progress his clergy had made in converting the members of another persuasion. It is also on record that in the course of his progress, he came to a parish where a Protestant rector and a Roman Catholic priest lived on terms of great unity, although the rector's congregation consisted only of his own family, a clerk, and a sexton.

Now, Sir, I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has ever considered what the result of such taxation as this may be. I would like to know if he has considered how many persons in this Dominion are affected by this taxation which presses so heavily upon people who have incomes of less than \$600. If he would condescend to examine the census returns, I think he would find five-sixths or nine-tenths perhaps of our population are affected by the taxation he imposes at his rate in the Territory of Canada, and with this practical result, that whereas all great national accumulations of wealth generally result from the savings of this class, the hon. Minister will find that if he persists in enforcing these taxes, he will not merely paralyze that class, but he will interfere with the proper education, and even the proper nourishment of those people and their children.

Now, I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has ever considered what the result of such taxation as this may be. I would like to know if he has considered how many persons in this Dominion are affected by this taxation which presses so heavily upon people who have incomes of less than \$600. If he would condescend to examine the census returns, I think he would find five-sixths or nine-tenths perhaps of our population are affected by the taxation he imposes at his rate in the Territory of Canada, and with this practical result, that whereas all great national accumulations of wealth generally result from the savings of this class, the hon. Minister will find that if he persists in enforcing these taxes, he will not merely paralyze that class, but he will interfere with the proper education, and even the proper nourishment of those people and their children.

posed to rest my case there, but I will point out to the House where I think these gentlemen were guilty of NEEDLESS AND IMPROPER EXPENDITURES. I do not admit that the hon. gentleman had the right to charge me or my colleagues for interest—at any rate more than to a small extent—on transactions which took place in 1878. He assumes what he has no right to do, that I intended to effect a loan of three million pounds sterling. But I leave that till I come to his remarks about his recent loan. When we come to ordinary expenditure, what do we find? Why, Sir, we find that these hon. gentlemen, under the head of ordinary expenditure, having expended a very considerable number of sums which I feel perfectly certain, had we remained in office, would not have been expended.

THE HEAVY ENGAGEMENTS he had inherited from the last Government—(Ministerial cheers)—and he was good enough to refer to our minds the unexampled prosperity which existed when he was Finance Minister in 1873. I desire to recall how that hon. gentleman MISTOOK INFLATION FOR PROSPERITY: how he then, in defiance of remonstrances from this side of the House, and particularly in defiance of my own remonstrances—(Oh, ah)—made that inflation the excuse for heaping enormous burdens upon the people of the country, and for adding deliberately and most needlessly the sum of one and one-half millions to the fixed expenditure of the country. It is a matter of public record that they increased the expenditure from \$11,000,000 to \$23,000,000. (Cheers.) They went out of office leaving unfulfilled engagements which, had they been fulfilled, would have added four or five millions more to the expenditure of the country.

On every bustings in Canada these hon. gentlemen raved the last Government for extravagance in matters of civil government, superannuation allowances, Indian expenditures, and Post-office Department. Now let us see what we expended in 1878, and what these gentlemen propose to spend in 1881. In 1878 the total expenditure for Civil Government amounted to barely \$823,000. Now, Sir, we are told \$917,451 are required—being an increase over our actual expenditure of only \$100,000. Sir, we were reviled without stint because in 1878 we found it necessary to ask a vote of \$106,000 for the purpose of providing for superannuation. I perceive that \$142,000 is the least these hon. gentlemen can get on with for their superannuation charges. For Indian service in 1878, \$421,500 was required. Now I see \$640,786 is demanded for the same service. In the Post-office Department, Sir, in which our extravagance had become rampant, we spent \$274,938; these gentlemen now demand \$852,000, being \$130,000 more than the late extravagant Government found necessary to expend. (Hear, hear.) I see, Sir, but one substantial saving attempted to be made, and that is in the matter of railways. Now it may be possible to carry this out to some extent. I confess myself that everything that has come to my knowledge, every thing that came to my knowledge while I was Minister of Finance, renders me very doubtful, indeed, as to the probable success of an attempt to diminish this railway expenditure to any extent that they were. Nevertheless I shall give my hearty support to, and shall heartily congratulate the Minister of Railways if his ability and energy do enable him to carry out the pledges which the Minister of Finance made on his behalf to effect the saving of which he speaks.

Now, Sir, you will observe that our greatest deficit was, compared with the greatest deficit of the hon. gentleman's leader, and of the hon. gentleman who was then acting as Finance Minister, stood in the proportion of 44.5 to fifty-eight per cent., and that the per cent. of deficit in our last year as compared with the per cent. of deficit in his last year, is to 25 per cent. ("Hear, hear," "Oh, oh," and cheers.) And as the hon. gentleman appears to be in a mood to make comparisons, I should say further that our worst deficit bore the same ratio to the best, that he bears to theirs as one is to thirty. And that, Sir, is not only a fair ratio of the respective deficits, but it is a fair ratio of the prudence, the economy, and the administrative capacity which characterized the two Governments. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) I would warn the hon. Minister of Finance, that when he talks of deficits he is treading on dangerous ground indeed.

He has been good enough to tell us that he, and he alone, looks to the future without any embarrassment, because he had obtained on the 1st of March, 1880, the sum of \$14,081,000 as the total result of our revenue for the past eight months. Now, Sir, I find that on the 1st of March, 1878, our revenue amounted to \$15,003,330; on 1st March, 1877, \$14,263,000; and on 1st March, 1876, \$15,616,876. I confess, particularly after hearing that the hon. gentleman expects to expend something like \$24,900,000 in the current year, I fail to see on what principles he expects our average monthly revenue of one and three-fourth millions to rise to something like \$3,000,000 per month.

It is due to the N. P. of the Finance Minister that there was something like six months of a continuous rise on the other side of the Atlantic; or are we to understand that there was an improvement in the United States which has reflected itself on our market and given us better rates of transport, because the hon. gentleman had been at great pains as he said to reduce, our trade with the United States? Why, Sir, as to his claim of creating an improvement in the lumber trade and shipping trade, these are the two great interests which he has most hampered and embarrassed—(hear, hear)—and yet it is for the improvement of these interests that the hon. gentleman takes credit for the N. P.

Referring to Sir Leonard's taking credit for nearly equalizing Canadian imports and exports under the N. P., which meant, that while our exports had decreased our imports had fallen off in still greater ratio. Sir Leonard called attention to the fact that Sir Leonard had seven years ago proclaimed the doctrine that an increase of imports meant better times. He quoted—and amid laughter at Sir Leonard's expense—under his budget speech of 1873, as proof of Sir Leonard's entire change of policy, and continued:— That was a considerable time ago, seven years have come and gone since the hon. gentleman held the position which he now occupies. We know that in seven years every fibre of the human frame is said to be changed. Am I to understand—the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper)