

Now, the hon Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), when he was pleased to make his budget speech, added, for the information of the House, some very interesting tables. They are what might be called tables at sight—illustrations, so to speak. And I hope that every Conservative in the country will read them, for they are a commentary upon these hon. gentlemen's record as statesmen in this country. There are some omissions, to which I wish to refer in a moment; but, in the meantime, I wish to point out some admirable things in these tables. Those who look at them find that the deposits in chartered banks in 1874 amounted to \$65,000,000, and, after four years of Grit statesmanship, they amounted to \$62,000,000, while, after a few years of Conservative rule, the deposits in chartered banks increased to \$185,000,000. They find that in 1874, the amount in the savings banks was \$14,000,000, and in 1878, under Grit rule, they were still \$14,000,000; while in 1896, the amount had increased to \$85,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What were they in 1899?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not the figures here; but, no doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will be able to give them. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce went back to 1874—1878, and I am following him there. Then, let us take the discounts in banks—in 1874, they amounted to \$135,000,000; in 1879, they were \$110,000,000, and in 1896, they had increased to \$228,000,000. The deposits made with loan companies in 1879 were \$9,500,000, and in 1896, \$19,000,000. The failures in Canada in 1875 to 1878 averaged \$27,000,000 per annum in liabilities, while in 1893, they had fallen to \$14,000,000. At confederation, there were 2,278 miles of railway in operation. Under Liberal rule since that time 3,149 miles had been added, and during the Conservative regime the railways built amounted to 12,233 miles, as against 3,149 miles under the Liberals—not a very good showing for gentlemen who claimed to be nation-builders and empire-makers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How many years in each case?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That depended on the will of the people. The first term of Liberal rule was too long for the people; and I fancy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has had about all the years he will have in this term, and that very shortly, hereafter other gentlemen will make these statistics and publish these tables.

Now, as I have said, there are some notable omissions from these tables. When I come to examine these tables, I notice there is no column for debt; there is no column for expenditure, no column which would show that extravagant increases un-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

der hon. gentlemen opposite—but that is excusable, because there was no room on the page, the column was so long. I trust that when the hon. Minister of Finance republishes these tables of last year, he will add tables to illustrate the debt and expenditure; and, if the suggestion be not out of place, I would suggest that he add to these tables a picture of the Minister of Trade and Commerce—two pictures, in fact—one showing the Minister of Trade and Commerce out of luck and one showing that hon. gentleman in luck; because, for all time, these pictures will illustrate the disinterestedness and unselfishness of Liberal statesmen in this country.

I do not intend to go into details in regard to the expenditure, but in order to make the facts which I am presenting somewhat connected, I desire to repeat some figures. Robbed of all special pleadings and special explanations, the facts are that in 1896 we spent \$36,969,759, and in 1899, we spent \$41,903,502, or an increase of \$4,933,750. This is on consolidated revenue account alone. The per capita expenditure was, in 1896, \$8.14, and in 1899, \$9.72, or about one dollar and fifty-eight cents more for each man, woman and child in Canada or about nine per family. Oh, says the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there is a great difference, though! There is a difference, and what is it? The difference is that the hon. gentleman is in power now, and he was out of power in 1896; and he believes with the late lamented Hosea Bigelow, whom he has quoted very frequently in this House:

I do b'lieve the people want  
A tax on teas and coffees;  
And nothin' ain't extravagant,  
Pervidin' I'm in offis.

The hon. gentleman may be satisfied, but the people of this country are not satisfied. I would like to read to him the opinion of a paper which the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Burnett) will bear me out in saying, is one of the strongest Liberal papers in the Dominion of Canada; I mean the *Oshawa Reformer*—its name suggested its politics. On August 25, 1899, that journal expressed this opinion upon the expenditure of the Liberal government:

The government has done many good things, but, notwithstanding, the public expense is altogether too high and out of all proportion to the means of the Canadian public. The expenditure is growing at far too rapid a pace. The government might as well understand this at first as at last, that the financial part of their undertakings is not in keeping with their professions and that they are not approved by the people of Canada.

There is no gentleman in this House who will not say that that paper is one of the strongest Liberal papers in this country. Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the Minister of Finance wonder at what it says when he remembers the cries of ex-