

of the season. Prices were remunerative, and, in some commodities almost extravagantly remunerative. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at that our trade increased by leaps and bounds. On the first of July last, it had reached the five-hundred-million mark, and now it is on a fair way to the goal of six hundred millions. These figures, in themselves, do not tell us much. But if we make comparison of the trade of Canada, man for man, with the trade of some of the most highly civilized nations of the earth, we shall realize the extent to which we have made progress. England, which is the mother of trade as it is the mother of freedom, has a trade amounting to about \$100 per head of the population. The trade of Germany, of which we have heard so much of late years, and which has made such substantial progress, is only about \$50 per head. The trade of the United States, large as it is, and prosperous as that country is, is less than \$40 per head of the people. The trade of Canada, being a total of about \$500,000,000, amounted to no less than \$90 per head of the population. I know that I shall be told that these figures do not tell the whole story, as they give the record of the foreign trade only—the exports and imports—of the countries referred to, and take no account of the internal trade, there being no statistics of that internal commerce for any nation. And, as I wish to speak with fairness, I am prepared to say, as for my part I believe that, had we the full statistics of the trade of the United States and of Canada it would probably be shown that the United States has a greater trade per head of population than we have. But I also believe that it would be shown that we are a close, and ever closer, second. But, Sir, there is another feature in the case. No nation can live by itself, every nation must have a trade abroad, for it must seek to sell elsewhere the surplus of its products to those nations that, in respect of these products, have a deficiency.

In that respect, therefore, and since all nations look for foreign trade, I say with legitimate pride that we stand far ahead of the great American republic. The trade has expanded, the revenue has expanded, and we have just been told by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that the expenditure has also expanded. Of course it has. We are not flies on the wheel; we are alive to the situation and to the requirements of our country; and though the expenditure has expanded, it has been kept well in check and always within the revenue. The hon. gentleman said that in his opinion the expenditure was excessive, and he gave the opinion of Mr. Courtney in that respect. Mr. Courtney's opinion is one which no one can despise, on the contrary everybody must respect it. But it seems to me that the friend of the hon. gentleman who sits be-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

side him (Mr. Foster) must have felt rather uncomfortable when the opinion of Mr. Courtney was cited, because if, in this glorious present time when we have an abundant revenue, Mr. Courtney thinks that perhaps we should put a brake upon the wheel and check the expenditure, I think the hon. gentleman's desk mate must have felt very uncomfortable when he was in control of the finances, when there was a contracted revenue, and the expenditure was far beyond the possibilities of the revenue. There is the difference between us. It is not sufficient simply to compare the expenditure of one period with that of another period and to say, as we have been told very often that in the old days, under the old regime they spent less than \$40,000,000, whereas we at the present time spend almost \$70,000,000. It is not sufficient to put these facts opposite each other, because they give no accurate idea of the circumstances. An expenditure of \$40,000,000 may be an extravagant one, and an expenditure of \$70,000,000 may be a moderate one. It all depends upon the means of the people to bear the expenditure and that is a circumstance which was overlooked by my hon. friend a moment ago.

May I, Mr. Speaker, recall to my hon. friend a principle of economy which I am sure he is acquainted with, because it was formulated by a famous character of Dickens, one Micawber. Micawber, as depicted by Dickens, was not a model for a finance minister, still he sometimes had good ideas, though he did not put them into practice. This was his maxim: Annual income, twenty pounds; annual expenditure, nineteen, nineteen and six, result, happiness; annual income, twenty pounds and six, result, misery.

If this principle is true, I wonder what was the feeling of my hon. friend for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he had charge of the finances of this country, and year after year had millions upon millions of deficits. We are living now in happier days, we are putting into practice the principle of Micawber which, if it was sound in his days, is sound in our days. We do not expend all we collect, and therefore we have constant happiness. My hon. friend also referred to the character of our expenditure. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of telling us that we have no great public works to show for the money we have expended. 'No great public works'—I hear the echo. Well, Sir, if hon. gentlemen will only open their eyes and look about the country they will see that at this very moment there is, so far as a scarcity of labour will permit, a transcontinental railway being constructed to connect the waters of the Pacific with the waters of the Atlantic. Nay, if he will look over this country he will find scores of railways which have been constructed and which have added immensely to the welfare of the community. If