

sider that it was probably done by the vicious system of enumeration which prevailed, under which, to my own certain knowledge, many persons who had been absent from Canada for five, ten or fifteen years, and had no sort of intention of returning, were enumerated as citizens of this Dominion. Therefore I believe that if, as I suggested at the time, though I was not able to get it carried out, an honest enumeration had been made—or a correct enumeration we will say had been made—of the inhabitants of Canada in 1896, they would not have at all exceeded 4,800,000 at that time. Later on from the evidence given us by the last census in Manitoba, which took place in 1906, and the evidence of our statistical office, there is reason to believe that our population is now something like 6,800,000. It may be considerably more. At any rate the increase of population would have amounted, not to 25 per cent in twelve years as my hon. friend put it, but probably to 40 or 45 per cent, a very material difference, and if we were to add or to demand for the additional 40 per cent or the 45 per cent, take the small number, if we were to demand that similar allowance should be made for them as was made for the 4,800,000 we found when we came into office, then it would follow that at least of the remaining sum another \$15,000,000 could be struck off by reason of the increased population, and the fact that that increased population was scattered over an immense extent of territory and involved numerous expenditures, very considerable expenditures, which would not have occurred had they settled in the older and more thickly peopled parts of the country. Now, if those calculations are correct—and I think they will be found to be substantially correct, though as I said there may be a difference of opinion here and there on the point—it follows that of the \$38,000,000 expenditure which have been added in those 12 years, \$30,000,000 are fairly well accounted for in the two ways I have spoken of. That will leave a matter of \$8,000,000 to be accounted for. I am quite willing to discuss the question of those \$8,000,000 with my hon. friends here or elsewhere. First of all, I may take occasion to observe what I think no man who has any familiarity with public affairs will be likely to deny, that there has been

all over the country, as everybody knows, within those twelve years, largely owing to the great and rapid progress of the country, an enormous increase in the cost of labour and material which has affected all our public works, which has affected all our public employments and the salaries of our public officers. That alone might very fairly be an offset against the increase which I have spoken of, the increase of some \$8,000,000 within a period of twelve years; but it is better always in these cases to go to the actual figures and facts and the details of these expenditures. I find in 1896 that in the item of militia my hon. friends opposite, or the gentlemen who represented them on that occasion, reduced the total expenditure of the militia to \$1,136,000. I am inclined to think it was reduced for a purpose, and to make a showing, because it is very much less than it was in the preceeding year, but at any rate they reduced it to about \$1,136,000. Our expenditure for 1908 amounted to \$5,500,000. Of the \$8,000,000 of increase, therefore, about \$4,500,000, or \$4,400,000 to be exact, arose from the increased service of militia. How did that come about? Mainly it came about, or very largely it came about, from the fact that Canada has assumed the responsibility of maintaining the garrisons of Esquimault and Halifax at a charge of probably something over \$2,000,000, a thing which I believe not one single gentleman on the opposition side of the House objected to or protested against. They appeared to have considered that all right, nor have I heard that they objected in the slightest degree to the increase which took place in the other branches of the militia service, bringing the sum total up to the amount of \$5,500,000, as I have mentioned. As in the case of the militia, so likewise in the case of some other services. But, as some hon. gentlemen may say, the militia is a subject on which all honest, patriotic and gallant citizens, such as my hon. friend the ex-leader of the opposition, agree shall be maintained, we will take one which has been pretty well under fire and has been the subject of pretty severe criticism. Take that much abused and much maligned Department of Marine and Fisheries. In 1896 the expenditure under one