

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said he had not said what was attributed to him by the hon. member for East Toronto. What he had said was, that they could find no charge against him in the Public Accounts that he had sold himself to one railway company for \$4,000 and afterwards transferred his allegiance to another for \$5,000.

Mr. CAMERON said that implied that some member upon that (the Opposition) side of the House had done so. It was very unbecoming in any hon. member to cast a reflection of that kind upon the character of any hon. gentleman in the Chamber, and then try to get out of the difficulty in that manner. If the hon. gentleman reiterated his statement that some hon. gentleman had been guilty of an action of that description, the House should know to whom he referred.

Mr. BOULTBEE spoke at some length, objecting to the argument of the member for South Victoria, and holding that if any hon. gentleman saw an item in the Public Accounts which required explanation, he had a right to demand it upon the floor of the House. All members were not members of the Public Accounts Committee, and had not the opportunity of investigating these items.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE defended the hon. member for South Victoria, who had only said that members of the Committee of Public Accounts should not bring up items in the House which were under discussion and investigation before the Committee. He did not say that those who were not members of the Committee should not discuss items in the Accounts. As to the charges of increasing the expenditure preferred against the Government by hon. gentlemen opposite, he was prepared to show that the increase of work had been largely in excess of it. In the first place, he pointed out that in the Patent Office a very large increase had taken place in the work. In 1870 the number of patents issued was 611; in 1871, 1,923; in 1872, 2,673; and in 1873, 3,402 (Hear, hear.) Such an increase in the amount of the work must necessarily entail a very great increase in the expenditure under that head, which he would have hon. gentlemen to know was actually \$344 more than it was in 1870. That increase was in the interest of the country, and accounted for fully one-fifth of the additional stationery required in the Crown Lands Department. Then with regard to the number of letters registered in the Crown Lands Department—and all letters were so registered—in 1870 there were 15,478; in 1871, 17,380, in 1872, 21,614; in 1873, 24,618—showing an increase of 9,600 in 1873 over 1870. His hon. friends opposite might draw all the comfort they could out of that exhibit. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen could never expect that such an increase of business as that represented could have been carried out without a large increase in the staff of workers and general expenditure, and the only thing that astonished him was that it was not much larger. (Hear, hear.) Then there was postage, which

1869 was \$448 96—and he made no charge of extravagance against the Government of that day upon that score—was in 1873 only \$450—(hear, hear)—\$1 04 more than in 1869, when hardly half the amount of business was done in the Department. He might go on in the same way, and show how every species of work had increased in similar proportions throughout the whole Department. Then, so far as colonization roads were concerned, in 1869 there were 83 miles of new road made, and 47 repaired; in 1870, there were 79 miles of new road made, and 205 repaired; and in 1873 there were 236 miles of new road made, and 357 repaired. (Cheers.) This showed more than three times the number of miles of new road built in 1873 as compared to 1870, with a vast increase in the number of miles repaired. There must have been a great number of additional clerks, paper, and so on. The item of advertising was one which the people would make no complaint about, for the value of extensive advertising was fully recognized in every department of trade in the country. The hon. member for Lincoln had stated that he would carp at the Public Accounts as much as possible. He (Mr. Pardee) would rather that the hon. member would point out any items of expenditure to which he took exception, and have them discussed before the House upon their merits, instead of taking an unfair advantage of the Government by sending statements before the country not in accordance with the facts. (Cheers.)

Mr. SEXTON thought the comparisons instituted by the hon. member for South Grey were most unfair and altogether untenable. To compare the expenses of Government in 1870, when the system was first being initiated, with 1873, when the busi-

ness had increased by double in every department, was just about as fair as to compare the expenditure of a farmer when living in a log hut and a few acres of land cleared with his expenditure when he had cleared his hundreds of acres and was living in a good brick house. (Hear, hear.) To show that the public expenditure had increased, was no evidence of extravagance at all if it could be shown that we had an equivalent in the price of labour, the amount of business done, and the number of public works which were proceeding. It would be far better for honourable gentlemen to point to some item which they considered extravagant, or to some appropriation which they did not think was required. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. CURRIE commented upon the petty character of the charges which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were continually bringing up against the Government. They had actually found that somebody got a card table; that the travelling expenses of the Commissioner of Public Works amounted to so much per annum; and that the country had become possessed of a horse, cart, and harness. He congratulated his hon. friends upon their newborn zeal for economy and retrenchment, for he had seen other days with them. Notwithstanding all their professions, however, he doubted their sincerity, for they were in hearty accord with, and gave hearty support to, a Government which when in power at Ottawa was the most corrupt and extravagant we had ever seen in Canada. (Cheers.) When did these gentlemen show a desire for retrenchment or economy? (Hear, hear.) They made a great deal of capital out of their short connection with Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald, who was certainly a most prudent financier; but the days were when these gentlemen were violently opposed to Mr. Macdonald when he proposed to make some reforms in that direction. (Hear, hear.) Notwithstanding Mr. Macdonald's prudence, however, he found that the difference between the expenditure of his Government in 1868 and 1871 amounted to no less than \$632,000, while the expenditure of 1872 exceeded that of 1871 by \$31,000, and last year exceeded that of 1872 by \$612,000. This, however, would be accounted for by the increase of work in the departments, and the greater amounts spent upon public works. For instance, the Sandfield Macdonald Government in 1871, spent \$430,000 upon public works, while the present Government, in 1873, spent \$544,000, an excess of \$123,000. (Hear, hear.) In the former year the expenditure upon Immigration was \$57,000; in 1873 it was \$159,000. (Hear, hear.) In 1871 the amount expended upon education was \$351,000; in 1873 it amounted to \$463,000, or an excess of \$111. (Hear, hear.) Upon colonization roads, an item which hon. gentlemen would not condemn, the present year there were \$145,000 spent, as compared to \$55,000 by the Macdonald Administration in 1871. (Hear, hear.) In the four items to which he had referred, there was an increase of \$427,000, as compared to the sums expended for the same purposes by the former Government, and he pointed out that the Estimates for 1874 only exceeded those of 1871 by some \$35,000. (Cheers.) On the other hand, he would like to have seen the Treasurer show the likelihood of a large surplus instead of an actual deficiency of revenue as compared to expenditure, which was the practical result of his exhibit. From their past history, however, he had no reason to think that hon. gentlemen opposite would do better, or, indeed, quite as well, or that, if they had the opportunity, they would be one whit more careful as to the expenditure of the public money. (Cheers.)

Mr. CUMBERLAND could not refrain from replying to the statement of the previous speaker, that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House had never been advocates of economy and retrenchment. He regarded the fact of their having supported the Government of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald as sufficient proof of their advocacy in this respect. He condemned the consuming of the time of the House by entering upon insignificant details and paltry matters, to the abandonment of more important matters. The policy the Government condemned in their opponents was pursued by them whilst in Opposition. He regretted that the accounts of the Treasurer were so deeply embarrassed, and felt that a portion of the surplus should be put by, for with our increasing expenditure he thought the country might ultimately be brought to direct taxation. The Government ought so to limit its expenditure that each year they might reserve an amount with which to reduce the debt by which the country was oppressed. He hoped the time