

lately I had occasion to inquire of a gentleman very well conversant with that whole country what the result of expending that money in constructing the Crow's Nest Pass had been in the way of adding to the wealth and value of the properties thereby developed, and after taking some considerable time to examine it, he gave it to me as his opinion, and as a very conservative estimate which he supported by very ample proof, that in all human probability the construction of the Crow's Nest Railway under the government subsidy of \$3,300,000 had resulted in developing wealth to the extent of thirty or forty millions in the region which was then opened. (Cheers.) He went on to show—and this is of importance, ladies and gentlemen, to all of you—by constructing that railway we had developed industries from which at this present moment something like three or four millions are being expended in wages and in the purchase of materials for enterprises which could by no possibility have been developed unless this Crow's Nest Railway had been constructed; and I have in my hand here very ample evidence that so far as the revenues of Canada are concerned we are at least, Mr. Brown, not losers, but, on the contrary, very great gainers, by the amount which we sunk in that railway.

#### A Paying Investment.

Our capital charge on this \$3,300,000 amounts roughly to some \$80,000 or \$90,000. Sir, the return that we get in added customs duties and in added excise duties is in all human probability a matter of \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year from that source alone—(cheers)—and probably in three or four years, or five at the utmost, the added receipts to your customs and excise arising from the construction of that same railway will amply recoup you for every farthing that has been spent. Now, I call that good political economy. (Hear, hear.) I call that a wise expenditure. I say that if I am able to spend \$800,000 and put \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year into the treasury I do a good thing for the people of Canada. (Cheers.) I only wish it were possible for us to invest, not three millions, but thirty millions of your money equally profitably, and if I could I would do it to-morrow. (Hearty cheers.) Why, sir, within three years the revenues of British Columbia, for customs alone, have risen from about a million to two and a quarter millions, and although a large share of that is undoubtedly due to the development of the Klondike, a very large share of it, as our customs returns sufficiently show, is due to the expansion of the Roseland and the Kootenay country and the rest of the regions that have been opened up by the Crow's Nest Pass. Why, sir, to-day the excise revenue in Roseland and Nelson alone would more than pay the whole interest on the capital which has been expended by us in constructing the Crow's Nest Pass; and I only trust that the expenditure which you are now about to undertake for the purpose of opening up New Ontario and developing the Kootenay River, will prove half as useful and half as good. (Cheers.)

#### Prudence and Economy.

Gentlemen, remember this: I do not for one moment desire or pretend that all this is any excuse for extravagance or waste. On the contrary, the greater the revenue the greater the occasion for prudent and wise economy in laying it out; but I do contend that it is a justification for liberal expenditure for worthy objects. Sir, if there were any one of you who found his income within three years expended, I should, I think, that that man would be and should, and that you would admit that he was perfectly justified in indulging in some expenditures which would have been absurd for him to have made. If a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

#### Canada's Enormous Wealth.

And here you may very fairly ask, if you see fit: Granted that this country has enormously increased in imports and exports, granted that it has increased in the value of the annual income of its citizens, what fair ground is there for believing that these increases will be permanent? And here, gentlemen, I admit that we must, to a certain extent, depend on future years the gross mineral products of Canada, of all sorts, from her coal mines, iron mines, nickel mines, gold and silver mines, will likely have made up the one hundred millions of dollars, and I need not point out to you what an enormous source of wealth, not merely for the miner, but merely for the capitalist who invests his property in mines, but for the Canadian manufacturer, for the Canadian artisan, for the Canadian grower of produce, which these miners must consume, will be found in the extension and new addition to the wealth of the country, even if it amounts to but one-half of the amount which I believe is fairly estimated and fairly calculated for.

#### Canada's Trade Beats American.

Then we have another and very great source of wealth which up to the present moment we have hardly touched at all. I allude to the extraordinary amount of water-power which we possess along the

St. Lawrence and its tributaries. Up to the present time we have depended almost exclusively on coal as a motive power; but there appears to be very good reason for believing that the huge water-power which Canada possesses will shortly become a source of profit and wealth to its citizens and manufacturers equal, possibly greater, than the wealth which we expect to extract from our mineral resources; and, gentlemen, it may interest you perhaps to know that Canada has made the subject of very severe complaint from the volume of trade of Canada and the volume of trade in the United States. Sir, it is not a matter which any Canadian, I think, need be ashamed of. I have received within the last few days the details of the total volume of trade of the United States for the year 1898. They amount to \$1,924,000,000 of exports, and \$887,000,000 of imports, on which, be it remembered, a duty of \$200,000,000 was collected. Canada for the same year has a total trade of \$319,500,000; so that Canada with a population of about 5,300,000 in 1898, as against the United States, with a population of 73,500,000 by estimation in the same period, has a total trade of \$37.73 per head, as against a total trade for United States of \$26.16—(loud cheers)—the total volume of our trade being thus somewhat more than double the total volume of trade in the United States. (Applause.)

In the matter of exports Canada exports \$25 worth of goods for every man, woman and child in the country, as against \$16.70 per head in the United States. (Renewed applause.) In this connection I may say that the goods which are most noticeable that the durable goods imported into the United States in 1898 amounted to \$390,844,000, and the amount of percentage on those goods was 22 per cent. The durable goods imported into Canada amounts to a little over 28 per cent., very little more than one-half of the percentage imposed in the United States. That bears on a question which has been brought up, and which I frequently mention, namely, the allegation that the present tariff is a highly protective tariff. There is an easy method of distinguishing between a high revenue and a high protective tariff. Ours is a high revenue tariff, it is true. But that never was a protective tariff under which the imports increased as fast as those of Canada have done in a single year. Look at the American tariff and you will find that year to year the value of the American imports fell from \$750,000,000 to under \$700,000,000. Remember this, too, that in imposing the tariff it is quite possible for you, under a high revenue tariff, to impose a higher duty on American goods than on British goods. (Applause.) American imports will bear a revenue tax a higher tariff than British goods will bear, for reasons apparent to the whole interest. The tariff is not imposed and none other is wanted, for the preference which we have extended to the Mother Country, that should be sufficient. (Loud applause.) I may add that it is a gross mistake to suppose that the collection of taxes which has taken place in our preferential tariff is confined to the goods imported from England. Bear this in mind, that you compel the American manufacturer to reduce his prices to you in proportion. It may be true, but the fact that the volume of our trade with the United States has not greatly diminished, but the volume of American profits has greatly diminished, and in such case the Canadian consumer very largely benefits. (Applause.)

#### Perfident Questions.

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

promote immigration. We might have taken no steps to develop British Columbia. We might have taken no steps to extend the Intercolonial Railway—we might have left its terminus in a ploughed field as we found it. We might have given you a penny post. We might have taken to penny post to finish your canal instead of completing them in three. We might have done all those things, and possibly we might have saved apparently a few hundred thousand dollars on your annual expenditure. But had we done so, your annual income would have been many millions less than it is to-day. Had we done so, the wealth of the people of Canada would have been less by tens and tens of millions than it is to-day. Had we done so, the population of Canada would have been less by several hundreds of thousands than it is to-day. Sir, to my mind, the best test of the prosperity of a country, and more particularly the best test of its future, is the fact that it is a country where the people remain and seek their fortunes in it. Is it a country to which strangers from other lands come to seek their fortunes, or is it a country in which the people stay? Is it a country in which when you bring the people to it you find it impossible to retain them? What was the position of Canada in the years from 1881 to 1891?

#### A Voice—What about the bye-elections?

#### A second voice—What about the Senate?

Sir Richard Cartwright—You may leave the question of the Senate to the cheery, which in its own good time will doubtless take that million from off the necks of the people. (Loud cheers and laughter.) Now, sir, as I have said, I cannot but think that among you who are so ready to study these questions intelligently and carefully, those among you who will remember that within the last three years, as I have said, Canada has advanced by leaps and bounds in its material progress, that our population has increased, that our volume of trade has increased, that our exports have increased, that our revenue has increased, that our sources have increased enormously, that everything promises a reasonable continuance of prosperity if we are only true to ourselves—I will, I admit, that I am fully justified in saying to you that there is no cause for alarm because, by reason of the cross entries that I have alluded to, your annual expenditure appears to have been increased by two or three million dollars.

#### How Trade Has Grown.

And now here let me call your attention to one or two important facts. Sir, I said that I would not say that I was not a little more rhetorical flourish but a simple fact when I stated to you that, between 1886 and 1898 the trade of Canada had increased as much in a period of three years as it had done before in thirty years. Sir, I go back to the first year of Canadian Confederation, when we had no Prince Edward Island, when we had no British Columbia, when we had no Northwest Territories, and when we had no Manitoba. In 1867 the total volume of trade was just \$131,000,000. In 1885 our total volume of trade had increased to \$224,000,000, being an increase in that long interval of something like \$92,000,000. In 1898 our total volume of trade had increased to \$319,500,000, being an increase of \$95,500,000 in those three or four years, as compared with an increase of \$92,000,000 from 1886 to 1898. (Loud cheers.) Sir, I go back to the first year of Canadian Confederation, when we had no Prince Edward Island, when we had no British Columbia, when we had no Northwest Territories, and when we had no Manitoba. In 1867 the total volume of trade was just \$131,000,000. In 1885 our total volume of trade had increased to \$224,000,000, being an increase in that long interval of something like \$92,000,000. In 1898 our total volume of trade had increased to \$319,500,000, being an increase of \$95,500,000 in those three or four years, as compared with an increase of \$92,000,000 from 1886 to 1898. (Loud cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1870, under this administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt. In 1871 we added \$3,000,000; in 1872 we added \$2,417,000; in 1873 we added \$2,417,000; in 1874 we added \$2,417,000; in 1875 we added \$2,417,000; in 1876 we added \$2,417,000; in 1877 we added \$2,417,000; in 1878 we added \$2,417,000; in 1879 we added \$2,417,000; in 1880 we added \$2,417,000; in 1881 we added \$2,417,000; in 1882 we added \$2,417,000; in 1883 we added \$2,417,000; in 1884 we added \$2,417,000; in 1885 we added \$2,417,000; in 1886 we added \$2,417,000; in 1887 we added \$2,417,000; in 1888 we added \$2,417,000; in 1889 we added \$2,417,000; in 1890 we added \$2,417,000; in 1891 we added \$2,417,000; in 1892 we added \$2,417,000; in 1893 we added \$2,417,000; in 1894 we added \$2,417,000; in 1895 we added \$2,417,000; in 1896 we added \$2,417,000; in 1897 we added \$2,417,000; in 1898 we added \$2,417,000; in 1899 we added \$2,417,000. (Cheers.)

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been extravagant, as we have been, if a merchant's capital was suddenly doubled he would be justified in taking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1864 to 1899. In 1864 I find that the late government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1868 they added \$3,801,000 to our capital debt. In 1869 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt