

provided in the future in perpetuity, and so we are going on, and if we continue at the same ratio, we will have an estimate and vote of parliament in a few years of about \$100,000,000. The basis is, we are a growing country, and I am very glad we are growing, but it is not good policy or good management to increase the expenditure more rapidly than the growth of the country in wealth and population would justify. There is very much more I should have said on this question, but I have simply given expression to my views and pointed out what has been imposed upon the country by the legislation of this session. I know that possibly explanations will be given that this is not all to be paid this year. It matters not. If the enterprises to which we have given this money, above three or four million dollars, are railways which, if not built this year will probably be built next year, they should be of a character that justifies the granting of a subsidy or it should not be given. So, I repeat, it involves the country in an indebtedness of that amount, but we have to submit to it with the best grace possible, particularly as it comes from a supposedly economical government.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—The hon. gentleman has called the present government an economical government, and so it is.

Hon. GENTLEMEN—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Our predecessors in office, it is true, incurred a smaller expenditure for ordinary expenses in a year than we are incurring at the present time, but it was an expenditure which was unprofitable. Our expenditure has proved a profitable investment, and each year the country has grown in greater proportion than the expenditure made. The revenue was less than \$35,000,000 a year under a higher tariff, the year before the present government came in; while at the present time our revenue, under a lower tariff, is upwards of fifty millions of dollars. Now, what made the difference? The difference was due to the fact of the enormous expansion of the commerce and trade of the country, and our expenditure in proportion to our revenue is less than it was at the period which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. The hon. gentleman opposite has spoken about an expenditure this year

chargeable to revenue and capital account of \$67,000,000. He is mistaken about the expenditure for the coming year.

Hon. Sir. MACKENZIE BOWELL—I did not speak of the expenditure for the present year. I referred to the votes and estimates, because there was an expenditure last year above the estimates and we have to pay for it this year.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—There was an expenditure last year on capital account. My hon. friend has followed the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons and charged parts of that expenditure to the current year. In that he has made a mistake. I am not going to undertake to defend the expenditure which has taken place; all I can say is it has been a profitable expenditure for the country, and there has been a great expansion of the population and resources of the country in consequence of that expenditure, and that is our justification. If time permitted me, I think I could make a triumphant vindication of the expenditures which the government has made. I am not going to do that at this moment. I am anxious that this Bill should go back to the House of Commons in order that we may be ready for the prorogation, which will take place an hour and a half from the present time.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)—If the hon. gentleman is so anxious that this Bill should go back to the House of Commons, the government should have treated the Senate with a little more courtesy than they have done on the present occasion. They sent down a notice at one o'clock that the Senate is to be adjourned at 3 o'clock. After that notice is received here, there are laid on the Table two or three Bills, one of them, the Supply Bill, appropriating \$5,000,000 a month for the next twelve months. We have no opportunity to look into the various heads under which this money has been appropriated. Some of them, I have no doubt, are good financially, and may be justified by the country, but there are some which I, as a representative of the people, would not feel justified in advocating before any assembly of electors in this country.

Hon. Mr. TEMPLEMAN—The Prince Edward Island subsidy, for instance.