

sible allowances for that portion of the imports which represent the interest on British capital invested in foreign countries, there has been for a great many years a very large balance of trade against Great Britain, and I might further point out to the hon. gentleman that if he is alarmed at the impoverishment of the people which has taken place in consequence of this heavy balance of trade, and in consequence also of the enormous amount of revenue that is being collected, it is a singular fact, and worth his consideration, that while we have been impoverishing the people at this rate, the deposits in the banks, mostly from the savings of the people, have risen from something like two hundred million—I speak from memory—to about six hundred million in the present year, being an increase of between three and four hundred millions of deposits saved from the incomes of the people, I presume, and apparently deposited in the banks. The hon. gentleman declares that it is very much to our discredit that the people paid thirty-seven millions in 1896, and that they now pay one hundred millions for general purposes. It would take too long, and I would not like to inflict the House with an analysis showing how much was really paid. I will remark that it would be more correct to say that the people paid thirty-seven million in 1896 and that in the current year just passed they paid something like sixty-seven million, the remainder arising from actual disbursements on account of consolidated fund.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—May I point out that in '96 the revenue from customs and excise was twenty-seven and some odd millions, not thirty-seven.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I know that thoroughly, but the hon. gentleman spoke of the total expenditure on consolidated account, as I understood him.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If my hon. friend desires to eliminate from the revenue all other items with the exception of customs and excise, he should confine his argument—

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—You would have \$27,000,000 in the one case. It is true you would have \$57,000,000 in the other, but as the hon. gentleman knows,

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that includes a very large surplus—a surplus ranging from sixteen to twenty million. He was in error on one point also, a very important point on which I will have to differ from him. He says that they paid \$37,000,000 in 1896. The people paid a great deal more than that. The people at that time had really a very much heavier rate of taxation than now. The only difference is that to a much larger extent in 1896 the sums exacted from the people and paid by the people should have gone in the treasury. Under the system the hon. gentleman approves of, part of those taxes went in the treasury, and a very large part, far more than at present, went into the pockets of friends of the hon. gentleman who had obtained from the parliament of Canada the right to tax the people at their own pleasure, the fact being that a very great deal more was paid by the people of Canada in that way than is paid at present. I would rather see much less paid by the people of Canada, but that is a question on which I am not at the present moment going into detail.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Does my hon. friend take into consideration in this discussion the difference in value in goods imported at the present time, and those imported in 1896?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—A perfectly good point. A good deal of the increase is a nominal increase. There is no doubt about that. Wages are higher, the cost of living, and cost of material is higher, and a good deal of the extra expense of which he complains is due to those causes, which are not under control of the government, but which have arisen in part, no doubt, from the great prosperity which has fortunately for a long time befallen the people of the country, and, I might add that there is this other difference; that in 1896, and for a longer period before it, the population of Canada had been perfectly stagnant, and since then the population and the income of the people of Canada have been increasing in a ratio infinitely greater than before. In another place I have laid before the other House satisfactory proofs of the fact that the growth of the population was far less than the number as given in the census returns. Now, to-day, if we are spending a great deal more—the