

and statement is made by some gentleman, it would be incumbent to deny it at the time, it is not necessary in all cases—in all cases. The character of the gentleman making the charge determines that. If there was a gentleman whose opinion I valued and cared for, whose word I thought would carry weight in the country, then I would think it necessary to set my word against his word. Well, Sir, my hon. friend seems to think that in matters of moral perception, in matters of right and wrong, of propriety and impropriety, I am deficient. Well, I will have to labour under that disadvantage. If the hon. gentleman has been gifted by nature with a nicer moral perception of what is right and wrong, a nicer moral perception of the necessity of statements being made that are in accordance with the facts, let him rejoice in that; but let him not pour obloquy on another hon. gentleman not so highly gifted by nature. The hon. gentleman is assuming a role in this House. Although this discussion is rather out of order, I am rather glad to have it renewed, for when this subject was under discussion on Friday night, certain statements were made which I was not in a position, not having the necessary knowledge to answer correctly. I thought when certain charges were made against an officer in my department, that it would be well for me to have a conference with that gentleman and ascertain what he had to say in reply to the statements. I said: No doubt he would see what had been said in parliament, and would take note of it, and that no doubt he would speak to me about it.

I was not mistaken in the character of the hon. gentleman. He did speak to me and he spoke very freely and I want to say now in the hearing of this House, and I care not who receives it or who does not receive it, because I believe that my word will be taken by members on both sides of the House whose opinion I value and if it is not taken by others, I will be content to abide by it, that there was no attempt on the part of that officer to hide even what he had done. There is no attempt on the part of the officer to hide even what he had done. There is no attempt on my part to hide what he has informed me has been his connection with this matter. I have stated that to the committee: I have stated that he frankly admits that in days gone by he prepared information which had been used by a person compiling these 'political pointers' as they are termed and which have been referred to as campaign literature. Why, Sir, many of these statements were prepared at my request for use in this House, and have been used in this House. I think you will find statements in these 'pointers' dealing with the trade and commerce of the country that I gave to the House in the session of 1902. Some of the statements that are to be found here, if I am not mistaken, and I think I am not mistaken, were borne with us to Eng-

land when we went to confer in reference to trade matters and were made use of in our discussions with the Board of Trade. These statements were not prepared on the eve of an election, because many of them will be found in my speeches if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look them up. It may be that they are brought down to a later period when comparisons are made between one year and another, but substantially these figures are true. What objection is there to be taken to a gentleman who prepares statements, which statements have been used on the floor of this House and which statements, if you will, go out to the public in a printed pamphlet if they are true and correct? Who says that a minister does not avail himself of the services of his private secretary to look up details for him in reference to matters with which he has to deal? Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite believe that a minister's duties are very light, that he has the same time as when he was a member of the opposition to delve into trade and navigation returns and find these matters out for himself. For many years when I was a member of the opposition, I did that and I have not the slightest doubt that members of the government at that time were forced to avail themselves of the information compiled by those in whom they had confidence in their departments in order that they might use it in public debate. Take our foreign trade. Here is one of the statements that which there was no attempt to deny the responsibility of having originally prepared.

First, we will look at, and illustrate by comparison, our foreign trade, which is declared by all exponents of the science of political economy to be the best indication of the welfare of the country, the following are the figures:

18 years Conservative...	1878.. \$172,405,454
	1896.. 203,025,360
7 years Liberal.....	1903.. 467,064,685

Now, the point is this: Are these figures correct? Are they the figures of a partisan? Are they the records of the history of this country? If they be true, if they be correct, then, I hold that every patriot in this country, be his politics what they may, ought to rejoice in the knowledge that is imparted in the publication of these figures. True, there is a comment upon them. I myself made a comment upon them in the House. I have done it upon the platform, I can remember that, in those days gone by.

Here we have an increase of 66 millions in 18 years under the national policy, compared with an increase of 228 millions in the short period of seven years under the Liberal policy.

And the question is asked:

Astonishing, is it not?

And is it not? Is there anything wrong in that, anything that the public records and