

hospitals and charities, colonization roads and railway aid, and see what sums we would have saved in four years alone, viz., from 1833 to 1836 inclusive. If we had not exceeded the limit of expenditure and the measure of Provincial aid of the Macdonald Administration.

For these seven services alone the Macdonald Administration in its four years from 1833 to 1837 spent \$3,230,000, while the present Government for the same number of years from 1833 to 1896 spent \$10,019,220, a difference in the measure of aid of \$6,879,152 in four years.

By standing still, by marking time, by closing our ears to every suggestion of progress and advancement, we could in this way have kept in the treasury in these four years nearly seven millions of dollars, and added that amount to our surplus. Instead of keeping it in the treasury we gave it back to the people.

On the one hand we would have had just the less efficiently administered, impoverished schools, inadequate accommodation for the insane and the destitute, fewer cottages and beds for the sick in our hospitals, the newer and northern portions of the Province neglected and undeveloped for want of railway aid and colonization roads, and on the other hand a larger surplus.

We deliberately chose the former, remembering that an educated people was the most valuable asset a nation could possibly have; that wise expenditure rather than hoarding is oftentimes truest economy, and that no country in the long run was ever known to suffer through the munificence of its charities. (Applause.)

Moreover, sir, I wish now, with all respect to my hon. friends opposite what special right they have to pose as the political heirs of John Sandfield Macdonald, what have they in common with his economical methods of government? Have they not given their unwavering support for eighteen long years to a Government elsewhere, which was never accused even for a moment of ever seriously entertaining considerations of thrift or economy?

Hon. gentlemen opposite are not his heirs; they are pretenders and usurpers only. The real heirs of John Sandfield Macdonald as regards his methods of economical administration are to be found on this side of the House, rather than on the Speaker's left.

But, further, do our critics oppose for a moment imagine that the electors regard seriously their pretended burning zeal for economy?

The leader of the Opposition and his every follower in this House by their votes and speeches have justified and supported on all occasions from 1873 to 1896 a financial policy and methods of expenditure at Ottawa the very reverse of economical, which the people of the whole Dominion by their votes have very recently emphatically condemned.

DIRECT TAXATION.

In every one of the speeches of my hon. friend, the leader opposite, while on his pilgrimage, he keeps repeating the statement that the Province is going behind, that we are not living within our means, that direct taxation is staring us in the face.

Why, sir, this House has long been familiar with those old, stale, parrot cries rehashed over and over again these twenty years. The electors of the Province have time and again deliberately pronounced upon them, and the verdict has invariably been in favor of the Government.

The Province is not going behind. I will discuss the matter presently. Will my hon. friends opposite name the Province in our Confederation, the State in the Union to the south of us, or any country wherever situated, which is more progressive than ours, which is better circumstantially situated, which is further removed from direct taxation, or in which strictest economy in the strict sense has been more regally observed? (Applause.)

More than twenty years ago, and spasmodically ever since, the cry of the Opposition was that we were on the verge of direct taxation. The same melancholy claptrap—it is nothing else, Mr. Speaker—is now, on the eve of another general election, again resorted to.

GROWTH AND PROGRESS.
Is the Province going behind? Let us for a moment look beneath the surface, and not trust solely and blindly to desultory and inconclusive statements.

The total receipts of the Province from all sources from its very first year, 1867, down to the close of last year, 1896, amount to \$80,365,700. The total expenditures of the Province of all kinds for the same period amount to \$80,131,561.

We have thus a balance of \$233,000 on the right side of the ledger at the end of thirty years of satisfactory and continuous growth, expansion and development in a hundred directions. The indisputable fact, sir, is that we had to our credit in our books at the close of last year \$227,000.

Thirty years of progress characterized in a marked degree by liberal Provincial grants in aid of every deserving public object—educational, charitable, agricultural and otherwise, extensive additions in the way of public buildings and public works, to our permanent assets from time to time costing several millions of dollars; no service neglected, no waste of public money, no yielding for the sake of mere hoarding to the vice of parsimony, a large cash balance to the good, and an available surplus of cash assets in our trust funds, drainage debentures and other investments, amounting to millions of dollars over and above every obligation, present and future.

And yet my hon. friends opposite cry out, forthwith, that the Province is going behind.

The House will allow me, sir, to give some further details by way of fuller explanation.

It is plain, then, that we have not gone behind, taking under review the whole period of our separate existence as a Province, since, as I have shown, our total receipts from 1867 to 1896 inclusive have exceeded by a considerable sum, viz., \$233,000, our total expenditures. In these receipts I include interest on our trust funds which were assigned to us at Confederation. I am, of course, not taking into consideration at present the corpus of these funds.

SUMMARY, 1890 TO 1893.

Let us in addition, however, take recent periods and ascertain whether we are going behind or not. Last Parliament embraces the years 1890 to 1893, inclusive. Our total receipts for these four years amounted to \$16,516,570, and our total expenditures \$16,035,985. Instead of going behind, therefore, we saved out of our annual receipts during these four years more than \$480,000. It may be said that we sold annuities in two of these years to the value of \$248,000, and that this amount is included in the receipts. Deduct this \$248,000, and even then the total receipts for the four years exceed the total expenditures.

We should not, however, deduct this

\$428,000, inasmuch as during this period we paid out to retire railway aid certificates and annuities \$1,000,235. The proceeds of our sales of annuities are applied in retiring maturing railway certificates. If we deduct the special receipt we should also deduct the corresponding special expenditure.

Further, during the last Parliament we spent nearly \$2,750,000 on much needed public buildings, and added to that needed to our permanent assets. These large capital expenditures are properly chargeable to capital account and not to current revenue. They amounted in round numbers during these four years to \$3,419,000, made up of (1) \$1,090,265 paid out for railway aid, and (2) nearly \$2,750,000 spent for the erection of public buildings.

To meet these large abnormal expenditures we had in these four years, outside of our ordinary current revenue, only the proceeds of two sales of annuities amounting together to \$429,000 and \$700,000, received part in 1891 and part in 1893, as payment of Dominion bonds we held which matured in those years. We reduced our ordinary current revenue, only the proceeds of two sales of annuities \$631,900, and added that amount to our surplus. Instead of keeping it in the treasury we gave it back to the people.

On the one hand we would have had just the less efficiently administered, impoverished schools, inadequate accommodation for the insane and the destitute, fewer cottages and beds for the sick in our hospitals, the newer and northern portions of the Province neglected and undeveloped for want of railway aid and colonization roads, and on the other hand a larger surplus.

We deliberately chose the former, remebering that an educated people was the most valuable asset a nation could possibly have; that wise expenditure rather than hoarding is oftentimes truest economy, and that no country in the long run was ever known to suffer through the munificence of its charities. (Applause.)

Moreover, sir, I wish now, with all respect to my hon. friends opposite what special right they have to pose as the political heirs of John Sandfield Macdonald, what have they in common with his economical methods of government? Have they not given their unwavering support for eighteen long years to a Government elsewhere, which was never accused even for a moment of ever seriously entertaining considerations of thrift or economy?

Hon. gentlemen opposite are not his heirs; they are pretenders and usurpers only.

The real heirs of John Sandfield Macdonald as regards his methods of economical administration are to be found on this side of the House, rather than on the Speaker's left.

But, further, do our critics oppose for a moment imagine that the electors regard seriously their pretended burning zeal for economy?

The leader of the Opposition and his every follower in this House by their votes and speeches have justified and supported on all occasions from 1873 to 1896 a financial policy and methods of expenditure at Ottawa the very reverse of economical, which the people of the whole Dominion by their votes have very recently emphatically condemned.

1897—THE SURPLUS INCREASED.

I must now speak of the ten months of 1897, the full accounts of which we have before us. If our critics had waited until now to bring up these figures, they would not have repeated their doctored statements.

The Province is going behind.

I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that in all the speeches of the hon. gentlemen opposite that the Province is going behind.

On the first day of November last, 1897, we had to our credit in the banks not less than \$10,000,000; in aid of the sufferers by the St. John's fire \$10,000; for the Fish and Game Commission \$10,000, not to speak of our other considerable sums which are equally outside of the range of our ordinary current expenditures.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

In a doleful way our friends opposite complain and predict that our timber industry is being rapidly exhausted.

They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

Besides all these we must not forget that we have been able during the last three years out of our ordinary receipts to make large expenditures, not fairly or properly chargeable to capital account, of the value of nearly \$1,000,000. We paid out for railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.

At Ottawa the Parliament buildings and the various departmental buildings were not paid for out of current yearly revenues, but are charged to capital account.

Our new Parliament buildings, our assuring buildings, our public works, have all been paid for out of current yearly revenues and without borrowing a dollar.

Railway subsidies at Ottawa are not charged to ordinary expenditures, but to an account which bankers call "profit and loss."

Our critics claim it fair that one rule should prevail at Ottawa and a different one here. They charge our railway subsidies, our expenditure on public buildings, to ordinary expenditure and in this way they seek to manufacture deficits.