

with its less littoral extension; 37 for the comparatively unimportant province of Ontario; 4 for the tight little Island of Prince Edward; 1 for the province of Manitoba—which has been somewhat recalcitrant in certain matters of late; 1 for the Northwest Territories (for which, by the way, important provision is being made in another sense); 6 in British Columbia, and 1 in the immense Yukon;—making a total of 213 items of harbour and river improvements, which alone, if we are to be a sensible body and if we are really to look at public money as a public trust and to deal with it upon the principle that it shall be expended only where adequate returns may be expected, would take three or four weeks of the time of this House to thoroughly and properly discuss. Then, there are 25 general items in public works. So we have a total of 336 different items under public works.

Now, I find in these supplementary estimates—which ought to be the very small end of the annual expenditure—under civil government an extra vote of \$50,911: justice, \$33,000; agriculture, \$148,000; quarantine—which belongs to the Department of Agriculture—\$175,000; immigration, \$30,000; militia, \$1,734,000. For the Intercolonial Railway, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, there are items amounting to \$2,204,861; for the so-called National Railway, the Transcontinental, there is an opening item of \$2,353,000; for canals, \$207,000. These three latter items are on capital account. For canals, on income account, there are items totalling \$61,300. On public works—capital accounts \$645,000; public works—income account—\$2,349,000. And let me pause at the last item to say that in the time of the Liberal-Conservative government we were most vehemently denounced for annual expenditure on public works which in no year amounted in total to so large a sum as this. Then in the Marine and Fisheries Department we have certain little extra items. For instance, ocean and river service, \$365,000; in another department, of the Marine and Fisheries Department, an item of \$715,000; in still another, \$264,000; and in still another, \$800,000. This makes a total of \$1,400,000 of supplementary estimates for the Marine and Fisheries Department alone—all to be charged to income account.

I know and pay tribute to the inventive faculty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but with all his inventive faculty he has not yet found out a way to distribute any of this description of expenditure to capital account. However, he has years ahead of him, he is still young, and with his ingenuity, with these necessities pressed upon him for showing or keeping a surplus, by the vigorous use of his faculties, he will find out sooner or later some way in which a proportion of this may be attributed to capital expenditure, so that the magnificent surplus may still be had. I

Mr. FOSTER.

find that Indians call for \$97,000 in this final closing hour of the session; that for lands and miscellaneous in the same department, we have a sum of \$528,000 asked for, all but \$100,000 of this on consolidated revenue account. Then we come to that bright spot, that oasis in the administrative domain of this government, the Intercolonial Railway, which calls for \$1,250,000 on account of consolidated fund expenditure. And all these and some others added go to make the amount, as I said, of nearly \$14,000,000.

Now we all agree, it is absolutely impossible there should be any disagreement, that a state of things like this is not conducive to good administration, that it is not consonant with a proper parliamentary check and control over the expenditures of the country; that there is not in it a single favourable element towards that contribution and consensus of wisdom and experience which a parliament like this, sent from every part of our country, combines within itself for the solution of what is best to be done with the amount of money we have, and to retain reasonable control of it. I do not think the Prime Minister himself, fertile as he is in expedients and in reasons for palliating crimes like this—I do not think even my right hon. friend will be able honestly to get a reason for this kind of thing. I know one thing he will say: You did it yourselves when you were in power. Now may be he will not say that after I have brought it to his mind; but if he does say that, there are two considerations I would like to urge upon him and the House; one is that we did it to a very small extent, that we did it against the combined and vehement protest of the right hon. gentleman, then the leader of his party in opposition, and all the men of his party with him. They declared that it was not a proper condition to be imported into parliamentary expenditures and expropriations. Now since these gentlemen have come into power this practice has grown, prevails to a limited extent with all governments, I suppose—there are circumstances which will always make it necessary that there should be some fringes of expenditure to be provided for well up to the very last days of the session, no fair-minded man objects to that. But there is every difference between that and this deliberate keeping back of a vast quantity and a very material proportion, one-sixth of the whole in this case, of the estimates of a great expenditure contemplated for the current year—a great difference I say between these fringes of expenditure which must be provided for, and such an amount as this.

Now what happens? Here we are. There is no good in bringing down estimates to parliament at all unless it is to ask its advice upon them. I presume we will all agree upon that. No one now assents to that old and long established principle of action, that all a parliament had to do was