THE CAUSE OF OUR PROSPERITY

The Laurier Administration Does Not Deserve to Get Any Credit For It.

All the World Is Prosperous Now, and Canada Shares in the General Activity Because the Conservative Policy Was Maintained --- Mr. Foster's Criticism of Mr. Fielding's Budget Speech.

In the House of Commons on March 27, Hou. George E. Foster made the following reply to Mr. Fielding's budget speech:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to day, with a good deal of pleasure to common the sound of plain, and, I hope, truthful criticism of the address, he spoke of the history of make as a story, combining certain peculiarities; and, I think, it would be not travelling out of the record, if I were to say that the hon, gentleman's speech bears all the marks of a story easily and plain ly recounted, gathered from the statistics of the Government, of the business indressly of the travelling of the business indressly of the country, very much disjointed, and, I may, comment whose inconsistencies are quite as glanger and the principal points touched upon by my the statistics of the Government whose inconsistencies are quite as farming as were the weakingsess of in succession of the seed of the server of the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government whose inconsistencies are quite as glanger to say, somewhat tortured for the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government whose inconsistencies are quite as glanger to say, somewhat tortured for the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government, which is four the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government will be the four the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government was to have been shunned. He took no friend, and he listene of the vice Any the story of the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government with the statistics of the principal points touched upon by my the financial and fiscal affairs of the government with the financial and fiscal affairs of the government with the financial and fis posite during that year; he would look in vain for any inquiry into, and any comparison of the courses and currents of the trade of this country, of for any discussion of the tariff as affecting the great problems of labour and industry in Canada, some of which are very close now? to a public decision, and public action in this country; and he would have risen from his seat without having had one; single proposition placed before him by my hon, friend for the solution of the great and vexed questions which are pressing for solution upon tions which are pressing for solution upon her public men. As I said before, it would rather seem to be a simple collation of statistics, the disjectal membra of which, if I may be allowed the use of a Latin term, seemed to have been promiscuously thrown wherever it was thought an appeal might be made, ad captandum, to people who have not had the opportunities of looking into, and so have not the power of discerning what are really the facts of the case as bearing on the questions under discussion. All through the hon, gentleman's speech there seemed to be a leading up to the reiteration of the almost endless refruin: Behold what a people we are—"Is not this great Babylon that I have built?" And, no matter from what quarter the facts are taken, Babylon that I have built?" And, no matter from what quarter the facts are taken, whether from the first years of Confederation, fragments were extracted, or whether joined to them were fragments from later years—no matter, everything was done, anything was done, which could be used to prop up the idea often made in so many words, but more frequently by inference and appeal, that all the wonderful progress of to-day had its origin and is now mainand appeal, that all the wonderful progress of to-day had its origin and is now main-tained by the gentlemen who, for the pres-ent, are governing affairs in this country. There was a great glorification of what was called generous expenditure. There was a great glorincation of what was called generous expenditure, and of increased-revenue; but there was a very discreet avoidance of the obstructive contrast between the professions and policy of these gentlemen, when they were out, and the performance of these gentlemen now that they are, in.

INFORMATION LACKING.

My hon, friend was so hurried, along this articular line, that he had not the time begive the House some very necessary in-formation which I think he should have formation which I think he should have given. For instance, he quoted immigra-tion returns, beginning his statistics, so far as immigration from the United States tion returns, beginning his statistics, so far as immigration from the United States is concerned, with the year 1897, and prefacing his figures with the remark, that there did not seem to be any statistics with reference to them up to that period; and then after quoting them all, as a strong argument in favour of the propositions which he was sustaining, it was found that he had not gone to the trouble of ascertaining on what these statistics were basedwhether they were simply the numbers returned by the immigration agents, whether they were the numbers taken down by the customs officers as the 'people came across the border, or whether they were persons who had actually settled on land or had taken in their abode in Manitoba and the North West. Yet we all know that this same immigration from the United States had been going on long before 1897. He spoke of the fact, which we are all glad to know is now about to become a reality, that Candain securities will be equal to the best British securities, so far as the investment of trust funds is concerned. But he did not have the time to lay before this House, or to give information to this House, as I think he should have done, of the terms, and the conditions, upon which these securities are to be taken in respect to the trust funds which are invested in them. He came down with a very important proposition, no other than the proposition to admit the products of a large and fertile is land in the West Indies into community of free trade with the Dominion of Canada; and he had not either the time or did not take the trouble to give to this House one single line of information as to how this introduction of the products under free trade into Canada would differentiate or affect the trade of this country. He took an important step in giving a boaus by way of remitting the customs duty upon expensive machinery for the beet root industry in this country. But he gave the House no information as to whether later experiments and the experience of the last ten or fifteen y concerned, with the year 1897, and pre-

convention of 1803. Mr. Davies, now Sir Louis Davies, the present Minister of Ma-rine and Fisheries, declared:

The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure, without injury to the pub-

The Hon. David Mills, now Minister of Justice in this Government, estimated that "The probable saving would be four Mr. John Charlton, at that time and still

at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of five million dollars per annum, with-out impairing the efficiency of the ser-

And Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, now the leader

And Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, now the leader of this Government, declared in Toronto: If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie: and I say that, although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, for nearly twenty years went bellowing through this country against the great expenditures of the Government, declared from his place in this House:

clared from his place in this House:

For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of forty million dollars, or thirty-eight million dollars, altogether too large for the prosent resources of Canada. I say that it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is atterly unjustifiable.

The present aconomical Minister, the Post-master-General (Mr. Mulock), who, when he was trying ato get into office, objected to such things as the Governor-General's salary, shouted himself hoarse over seventeen or even fourteen Cabinet Ministers in a country like Canada, swallowing up the country in an attempt to governor the country in an attempt to governor the country in an attempt to governor the country in a stempt to governor the country in the countr money of the country in an attempt to gov-ern the people, in 1895 declared, with his hand on his heart:

who can justify the expenditure of our country to-day? It cannot be justified by the wealth of the country. There is nothing to warrant this enarmous expenditure of nearly \$38,000,000 except the fact that we are burdened down with debt and with office-holders, great and small.

And Mr. Paterson, now a member of this Government, in 1890, declared : Government, in 1890, declared:

In 1890 we were taking \$6,115,000 more in taxes out of the people than we should, and we spent \$7,571,000 more than we should. He declared that an gra of economy in expenditure should be at once entered upon.

Mr. David Mills, at that time, but now the Minister of Justice, declared in 1893:

We say that the government of this country may be carried on for a very mash smaller sum than that which is now being taken out of the pockets of the people for that purpose.

We are asking for a reduction of taxation; we are asking for economy in the management of public affairs.

Mr. Charlton, at that time, and still, a member of this House, declared that the people were becoming disgusted.

They see the taxation from customs is increasing, they see the public debt piling up, they see the inordinate increase in the expenditure, and our people are leaving the country in disgust.

Mr. Mills again declared in 1889:

I have no doubt at all that the effi-ciency of the public service might be increased and the expenditure dimin-ished by almost one-half. THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.

On a special point, the present hon. Mitter of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richardwright) declared

and extravagance that we should find it necessary to augment our number to seventeen. This is far too many, and is a dissatisfaction to the country.

And, if I may be permitted to join the fless to the greater. I would say, that, in 1894, the present hon member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), said: I must take exception, in the first place, to the office ever having been created.

What office? The Ministership of Trade I do not see why it was created, un

less it was to give a resting place, for the balance of his life, to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position, drawing \$7,000 a year for virtually doing nothing.

drawing \$7,000 a year for virtually doing nothing.

I suppose the hon. gentleman now is willing that this office shall be retained in order to give a resting place for the "onlooker" of the present Cabinet, who has passed his period of active service. What are these that I have been reading,? These statement that I have been reading represent the solemn pledges of grown men, who have lived in this country and engaged in its politics for thirty, twenty-five and eighteen years. These are the utterances of men, who stood before the people, with their hands on their hearts, and declared that they were honest and truth-telling; these are the utterances of men, all anxious to climb into power, taking hold of these pledges as of the rungs of a ladder, by which they have gained power, but which, after they have gained power, they have kicked over, and broken entirely the pledges which they made. Bron. gentlemen smile as I recount these things. Why? Because they believe there is no longer necessity for truth and honour in the public men of this country, because they believe there is no longer necessity for truth and honour in the public men of this country, as we have to be contemned, as utterly to be despised as are their promises so solemnly made and so often repeated before the people? Is there any reason why these gentlemen should not cover their faces with their hands whenever they meet their electioneering work, they are going to make solemnly made and so often repeated before the people? Is there any reason they these gentlemen should not cover their faces with their hands whenever they meet their electioneering work, they are going to political oblivious as surely as he has engaged in public life in that country? Do they shelieve that, by means of the machine which they control, of the creatures that they take into their confidence, and send off to do their electioneering work, they are going to political oblivious as surely as he has engaged in public life in that country? The promises of the proposition of thi

TAKING MONEY FROM THE PEOPLE. Now, these hon, gentlemen came in, and what have they done since they came in? What have they done with the expenditure of this country? The hon, Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), said, in a light and what have they done with the expenditure of this country? The hon. Minister of this country? The hon. Minister of this country? The hon. Minister of this country way: We had last year more money; we had a revenue \$6,186,000 greater than we had the year before. (Great applause from the back benches!) Let me translate that into plain English, such as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce would have used in 1896. What does it mean? That you are taking out of the pockets of the people, the wage-earners, the labouring classes, the farmers of this country. \$1.16 per head more than the previous year for every man, woman and child in Canada. He made the statement that they had taken five millions and odd more in customs and excise than they took last year. Again applause from the back benches. Translate it, and what does it mean? That from these people, who, in the language af my hon. friend opposite, were "bled white," the farmers, the people whose backs were and above what you took the year before in taxes alone. Then, Sir, he boasted that he had a surplus of \$4,837,000. It was again greeted with applause. The translation of this into language of old times would have been: "A surplus, Sir! You have no business with a surplus; when you take sufficient out of the pockets of the people of this country to care for the ordinary consolidated fund expenditure and services, you have no business to take more. You should have let that remain in the pockets of the people, who could use it a great deal better than you could use it here." My hon. friend was very solicitous lest we should confuse the expenditures upon consolidated fund and capital. He said that some gentlemen were apt to confuse them. Who are the gentlemen? They are apt to be confused, when we find the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) spreading upon the estimates and voling through this House, on the lines of capital expenditure, hundreds of thousands of dollars, which, in preceding Governments, were always met out of consolidated fund and charge

TWO GOVERNMENTS COMPARED. TWO GOVERNMENTS COMPARED.

It has been stated over and over again, by hon gentlemen opposite, that, when the late Government were in power, they were a very extravagant Government. I wish to put a table before the House, and I will read the figures contained in it. It gives the expenditures on consolidated revenue account, and also the total expenditures in parallel columns, consequently, I offend in neither research I do not confuse the two. spect, and I do not confuse the two.

EXPENDITURE ON CONSOLIDATED FUND ACCOUNT AND TOTAL EXPENDITURE.

Consolidated Total Expenditure. 1987-1891 (average) \$36,328,821 1892 33,765,894 1893 33,814,052 1894 37,885,025 1895 38,132,005 36,949,142 38,349,759

friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), lest he fall into a trap.

Now, Sir, when you come to the summation of that matter let it for ever silence gentlemen who state that the Liberal-Conservative Government for the last ten or fifteen years of its existence was an extravagant Government as measured by great increases in public expenditure. What is that summation? It is that the Liberal-Conservative Government spent in totality \$388,237 per year less from 1892 to 1896, than from 1887 to 1891, and that the present Government has exceeded the Liberal-Conservative average expenditure from 1892 to 1896 as follows:

In 1897 by \$ 830,992 In 1898 by 3,192,518 In 1899 by 9,400,872

And, as estimated by the Finance Minister for this current year of 1900, they will over-expend the average expenditure of the late Government from 1892 to 1896, by the sum

of \$10,908,255.

Now, Sir, I invite any gentleman on the other side of the House to take the public accounts which he can have put in his hand and to deny one single statement that I have made with reference to a comparison of this expenditure as between the two

of Customs and by the Dominion Statistician, an increase of \$1.58 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion. Now, Sir, let me make another comparison. In 1893 it was that my right honorable friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) denounced the Liberal-Conservative Government for its extravagance, and declared that he would bring the expenditure of this country to two millions or ture of this country to two millions or three millions less than it was. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the comparisons?

Consolidated Fund 51,542,635 Increase . . . \$5,089,443 \$10,689,108

And yet these hon gentlemen claim that they have fulfilled their pledges. Having driven out a Government which was so extravagant, these gentlemen have marked, and marked in a significant manner their appreciation of economy by spending \$10,689,000 more in the last year than was spent in 1893. Well, Sir, that is not the best of it or the worst of it; for the estimates given by the Finance Minister for the current year are as follows: That the expenditure on consolidated fund will be \$43,175,000, and on capital, \$9,875,000, a total expenditure of \$53,080,000, as compared with a total expenditure in 1896 of \$41,702,383. In the current year, the revenue is to go up to the current year, the revenue is to go up to \$51,000,000, an excess of \$4,400,000 over last year, and the expenditure is to increase over that of the present year by \$1,500,000.

THE INCREASE OF THE DEBT.

THE INCREASE OF THE DEBT.

Now, Sir, having made this comparison, I wish to come back to the statement which was made by the Minister of Finance. He desired to show, as regards the increase of the debt, that the present Government was in a much better position than the late Government; and how did he attempt to show that? Why, Sir, he took the years from 1878 to 1896, and said that in those eighteen years the debt was increased by \$118,000,000, an average of \$6,563,000 per year, whereas from 1896 to 1899, three years, there was an increase in the debt of \$7,700,000, or an average increase of \$2,503,000 per \$118,000,000, an average of \$6,563,000 per year, whereas from 1806 to 1899, three years, there was an increase in the debt of \$7,700,000, or an average increase of \$2,503,000 per year; and then he imagined that he had satisfied this House, and this country, that he had proved the finatter up to the hilt. Was there ever a more unfair statement made? Was there ever a more flagrant outrage committed upon all reasonable rules of comparison? The hon, gentleman takes the period from 1878 to 1896, and he compares the increase of capital expenditure in those years with the increase in the three years just past, when Canada had almost completed her house and installed her main furnishings, and now had but to provide the lesser requirements in the various departments of the public service. Let me read to my hon, friend some figures, and then see if he does not himself feel ashamed of having attempted to palm off so unfair a statement upon the country. From 1878 to 1896 we were building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we spent \$85,000,000 of capital on that road; in the three years past these gentlemen have spent just \$23,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway. From 1878 to 1896 we spent on canals, \$33,000,000; in the last three years these gentlemen have spent \$0,300,000; while these hom, gentlemen have made an appropriation of only \$260,000. We spent on the Intercolonial Railway branches, \$20,500,000; they have spent \$1,400,000. We assumed the St. Lawrence debt, \$2,700,000, and went on thereafter with the improvement ourselves; they have assumed nothing with regard to the debt incurred by the Montreal Harbour Commission in improving the St. Lawrence. On the Quebee North Shore Railway we assumed \$2,304,000; they nothing. On territorial expenses we expended \$900,000; they nothing. And yet the Finance Minister of this country thinks it is not beneath his dignity, and that it is fair and reasonable, to make a comparison between these utterly dissimilar periods as regards great expenditure. On the North-West Rebellion we paid

dant revenues of the country? Or if they producture and yet not increase the debt largely; but the plain truth is told by the total expenditure, and it is this plain truth that this House requires and that the country needs. The House will notice that the average total expenditure of the late Liberal-Conservative Government from 1892 to 1896 was 1893 by about \$400,000 per year than from 1887 to 1891. In 1896 it was \$41,702,883.

Now. Sir, when you leave the year 1896, what do you find? You find that in 1897, the average total expenditure rises to \$42,952,785.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not want to interrupt the hon, gentleman, but would he state again what he makes the total expenditure for 1896?

Mr. Foster—The total expenditure for 1896 is \$41,702,883, and to assist my hon. If riend (Sir Richard Cartwright), I will tell him what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has had to tell me in this House for three several times, but only upon my jogging his memory, namely, that in a bookkeeping way he charged up to the Government expenditure in 1896 2,394,000 for the North Shore Quebec Railways subsidy, which was a liability incurred in 1892, and not in 1896. And though he included it in railway subsidies actually paid in 1890, I challenge the Finance Minister to rise in his place now, and tell this House that he total sum in the railway subsidies of 1896 to "the late Government, and to this day he is simply paying the interest, as was the condition of the grant made in 1882. That, is why I wish to assist my hon. frend (Sir Richard Cartwright), lest he fall into a trap.

Now, Sir, when you come to the summation of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of that matter let it for ever silence on the fall of the matter le

I ask how it was got. \$1,100,000 was derived from two of the most odious and oppressive taxes which were never imposed in any civilized country before under similar circumstances at least—the taxes on breadstuffs and fuel. If he really wants to relieve the people, let him remove the taxes on breadstuffs and coal.

and coal.

If my hon, friend boasts of a surplus today, there is an hon, gentleman sitting
close beside him who will tell him that
he need not look around very long for a
method of remitting that to the people, and
thus ridding the people of what this prominent member of the Government declared over and over again, an odious tax
which should not be allowed in any civilized country—the tax on breadstuffs and
coal.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who said that?
Mr. FOSTER.—That was stated by Sir Richard Cartwright. But we have another authority on this question, also a member of this Government, by name D. Mills, and the Hon. David Mills said:

the Hon. David Mills said:

He boasts of a surplus. I say that a government is not entitled to have a surplus. There is no stimulus to economy when a large surplus remains in the hands of the government. A large surplus invites to extravagance, and has invited to extravagance in this country. The Government and Parliament of this country should inaugurate a system of economy.

That is a statement made in 1893 by a gentleman who is to-day a colleague of the Minister of Finance, and when the Minister of Finance comes down and boasts of one surplus of \$4,700,000 and a coming one of \$7,500,000 I refer him to his colleagues.

SURPLUSES AND DEFICITS.

SURPLUSES AND DEFICITS.

The hon, gentleman wanted to show that the era of deficits had passed, and that an era of surpluses had succeeded. Well, what years do you suppose he chose in order to make a fair comparison between the two administrations in the matter of surpluses and deficits, and how do you suppose he treated the question, even after selecting his ground? He took the years of Conservative administration of 1893, 1894 and 1895, and he said that in those three years there was a deficit of \$5,694,759. He then took the three succeeding years of the present Government, and he added up the surpluses and deducted the small deficit, and made a net surplus of \$4,800,000 and then adding this surplus to the former deficit, he exclaimed: Behold a betterment of \$11,000,000 Does my hon, friend think it fair to select a period of depression, such as existed in this country from 1893 to 1895, and to compare that with a period of the greatest expansion, as he himself says, ever known in Canada? Why did my hon, friend not go back to 1891? He would have found that in 1891 we had/a surplus and also in 1892, and he would have found out some other things. He would have found that in 1891, when we had a buoyant revenue and a surplus of \$155,971, with another surplus in sight for the next year. other surplus in sight for the next year, I, as Finance Minister of the Government of that day, came down to this House and wiped out entirely the duties on raw sugar, which were very high. If he had looked at the calculations he would have found the following result, and I give him this table for comparison:

Sugar tax Surplus. \$ 155,977 1,354,555 Deficit. Nil. remission 1891—\$ 227,474 1892—5,200,000 1893—4,000,000 1894—4,821,000 1895—5,603,521 \$19,851,995, \$1,510,532 \$5,694,759 all remission of taxation ...\$19,851,995 t deficit ... 4,184,227 Total remission of taxation ... Net gain to country \$15,667,768

Those are facts which were known to my hon, friend and which he might have taken into account in making his comparison, but which, unfortunately for him, would have entirely destroyed it. That no doubt was the reason why he ignored them. Here is another table. 1894 to '96. 1897—99. Excess. ther revenue. . . 26,200,000 82,000,000 5,800,000

Total excess 3 years (Liberal)..\$18,200,000 Expenditures on consol-idated idated fund . . .\$112,600,000 \$119,100,000 \$ 6,500,000 On Cap.
Account . 15,000,000 20,700,000 5,700,000

Total excess expen. 8 years (Lib.).\$12,200,006

Total excess expen. 8 years (Lib.). \$12,200,000 Making the comparison in this way, comparing the actually collected revenue in both cases, they collected revenue in both cases, they collected for the three years of their administration than we did in the three years of our administration which the hon. gentleman selected, and this would have entirely wiped out his so-called betterment of \$11,000,000, and left \$7,000,000 to the good besides, and not content with collecting \$18,200,000 more, they made an extra expenditure in these three years of \$12,200,000.

Surpluses, says my hon. friend. Does he know that since confederation there have been twenty surpluses in our financial history? Does he know that the Liberals can only boast of three of these, and that out of twelve deficits the Liberals are responsible for five, and the Liberals are responsible for five, and the Liberal Conservatives for seven. But of the seven, two were due to the paying of the North-West rebellion expenses out of the revenues of the country, and the other three were due to this remission of sugar taxation of which I have spoken.

I am willing to take a deficit when it is caused by relieving the burdens of the people, has this gentleman relieved? I fail to see. Sir, he has added taxation and sugar, under the pretense of giving a preference to the West Indies, which he knew at the time would not be operative, and he came up at the next session of Parliament and declared that it had not been operative. And why? Because at the very time he put on this duty, there was such legislation in the United States of America in respect of the countervilling duties, that it more than made up to the West India cane sugar producers for the preference he gave them. Yet he added from \$300,000 to \$500,000 on sugar under that pretence, and even when he acknowledged that it was but a pretense which was unfounded.

From 1891 to 1895, there were three sevent well well was unfounded.

ASTONISHING FIGURES.

ASTONISHING FIGURES.

Now, lest I overwhelm the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) with these astonishing figures respecting his own department, I will say, that, at long last, he has plucked up courage to pay the silver-lead smelting bounties in British Columbia, for which legislation was prepared and passed by the Conservative Government before they went out of office, and that a large part of the expenditure in his department is due to the paying of these long-deferred bounties. In the whole of the pages of comparison in the public accounts of this year, there are only four or five departments or sub-departments of government in which there has not been an increase.

government in which there has not been an increase.

Now let me say something with reference to the taxation of this country. The opinion has prevailed, made to prevail, by these hon. gentlemen very largely, that the taxation taken from the country by the Liberal-Conservatives was exceedingly high. This was urged as a strong reason for the deteat of the late Government. The pledges of those who are now in power led the whole country to believe that the load of taxation would be relieved if they were returned to power. It will be interesting to read these figures, taken from the hon. gentleman's own returns. In 1889-90, we had the period of highest taxation in this country, and I begin with that year.

VOLUME OF TAXATION AND REV-

		E	NUE.	
			Taxes.	Total Revenue.
1889-00	 		\$31,587,071	\$39,879,925
1890-1	 		30,314,151	38,579,310
1891-2	 		28,446,157	36,921,871
1892-3	 		29,321,367	38,168,608
1893-4	 		27,579,203	36,374,693
1894-5	 		25,446,198	33,978,129
1895-6	 		27,759,285	36,618,590
1896-7	 		28,648,626	37,829,778
1897-8	 		29,576,450	40,555,238
1898-9	 		34,958,069	46,741,249

We see, therefore, by these figures, that 1894-5, when the taxation was \$25,446,198, and the total revenue \$33,978,129, was the period of lowest taxation, and we know that from 1890 to 1894, including these years, three successive reductions had been made in the tariff of the country. Now, sir, what follows? That, whereas in 1880-90, \$31,500,000 were taken from the country in taxation, in 1894-5 that had been reduced to \$25,500,000, or in round numbers, \$6,000,000, largely by the tariff revises which had taken place under the Conservative Government. These figures, I think, are a striking commentary upon two things: First, the alleged extravagance and the high taxation under the Liberal-Conservative Government, and the beautiful way, the unique way, in under the Liberal-Conservative Government, and the beautiful way, the unique way, in which these economists have carried out their pledges and reduced the taxation by increasing it to \$7,190,000 from 1896 to 1899.

Well, sir, there is another way of making comparisons, which is the taxation per head, and that will be shown by the following table:

Increase, 1896 to 1899 ... 90 1.16

That is to say, the reduction per head from 1890 to 1895, under a Conservative administration, was \$1.49 in customs, and \$1.58 in customs and excise both. From 1896 to 1890, the increase in customs alone is 90 cents per head, and in customs and excise together, \$1.16. And this past year is but a promise of what the present current year and the succeeding year are to be in the way of still greater increases.

COMPARISON OF TARIFF RATES.

COMPARISON OF TARIFF RATES.

Now, sir, I want to say a word on the tariff rates so, as to make a comparison which will bring out as clearly as we possibly can what is the difference between these hon, gentlemen under what they call their low revenue tariff, or moderate tariff, and the Liberal-Conservative Government under what the hon, gentlemen opposite denominate as the extravagantily high national policy duties. Now, I am not going to make these calculations myself. There is one thing that a member of an Opposition can sometimes get out of the Government, that is, information, and when these hon, gentlemen do get their blue-books down—which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has not done yet, and the lack of which I felt in my preparation for my reply to the hon, gentlemen. who spoke on Friday—I say that when we do get the figures made up by themselves, I propose to take them as long as I think they fairly conserve the facts, and are based upon impartial lines. So, I take from the trade and navigation figures, the duties on dutiable and free imports into this country for home consumption and present it as follows. The highest year of tariff rate was in 1896, when it was 21.65 per cent. The House will see that from 1889 to 1835 the percentage rate of taxation fell from 21.65 to 10.99 under the successive reductions of the tariff which were made by the Liberal-Conservatives. In 1896, the rate goes up, because, as I said, a part of the sugar duties were put back, and the rate in that year was 18.28.

Now, what is the state of things which they disclose? If we compare 1889 with 1895, there was a reduction of 4.66 per cent. in the rate of taxation under the Liberal-Conservatives. If you take the imports of 1895, which were \$105.232,000, you will find that 4.66 per cent. of it is \$4,900,000, that is to say, the reduction in the rate of taxation from 1889 to 1835 was 4.66 per cent; and the actual volume of taxation taken off on that basis was \$4,900,000. Now we will take 1896, their own figures still. The tariff ra

Mr. Foster—I will carry or son a little farther. From I period of five years, the avenuation tariff was 17.47 per cent. So that if years of the bon. gentlemantion, they have reduce nates by 39-100 of one Now their answer to be: Well, but, in 1897, we thing with the tariff until perith or two months of the

thing with the tariff until month, or two months of twell, then, we will take 1898 years. During these two years was 16.82 per cent; and that from the average rate fre it gives a reduction of 65-licent. of the average tariff will say: Our full preferencionce in these two years. The the year 1899, when, by their on, their rate was 16.70; this of 77-100 of one per cent. It is the average tariff rate from Now, these are statements when their own figures, which the House and which can be country and pondered a lowing table shows the rate 1889 to 1899 inclusive:

1889 to 1899 inclusive:

Rate of Duty on Imports :
sumption, Dutiable a
Under Liberal-Conserv.
1899 ... 21.65 p.c. 1897 ...
1890 ... 21.21 p.c. 1888 ...
1891 ... 20.06 p.%. 1899 ...
1892 ... 17.56 p.c.
1893 ... 17.38 p.c.
1894 ... 17.13 p.c.
1894 ... 17.13 p.c.
1896 ... 18.23 p.c.
1896 ... 18.29 p.c.
1896 ... 18.29 p.c.
1896 ... 18.29 p.c.
Average 1882-96, 17.47 p.c.
Average 1887-99, 17.17 p.c.
Reduction, 30-100 of 1 p.c.

country, how would it have in the Trade and Navigation year? He knows that that els would not have been take els would not have been taket tion in this country, and tha proportion, comparatively, now for home consumption that comes in from the Unipasses through the country in exported from this country duce. I ask the hon. Minist if, under these conditions, had been 23,000,000 hushels of brought into this country, it would it have been entered-sumption or under general hon. gentleman knows that I it would have been entered sumption except that small sumption except that small was actually intended for gone into the home consump the calculation of the revenus would have gone out as foreign ported. Now, the thing is can free, and I ask the hon. Means to take his Trade and turns, to turn up the book much corn, from the United tered in the column of total not included in the home commupon which the scale and is to be calculated. How must I venture to tell him that he bushel, but he will find hushels of American corn we this country, placed in the returns; entered for home that the value of that was 88 he will go to the column of will find that of that \$23, 18,009,847 bushels, valued have been exported from try, as foreign product, the try. If the hon, gentleman henestly with figures he will clerks of his departments to 32,683 worth of corn, entered consumption, but which did home consumption, and wheneant to go into home consumption to the exports of foreign pro

consumption, but which die home consumption, and whi meant to go into home consumption to the exports of foreign prosibility of the exports o