

I could not get my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to pay the slightest attention to that celebrated article when he addressed the House two years ago. Might I not ask from the hon. gentleman the favour of passing reference to that published statement of his? Might I not ask him to make a comparison between the figures of our present expenditure and that which he denounced in those days, and especially draw attention to the fact that he attributed all the wretchedness and misery and maladministration in Canada to what do you think? To the fact that in Canada at that day protection existed. Of course we know that, according to the right hon. gentleman's view, no protection exists in the present tariff, and I think we are entitled to some other argument from the right hon. gentleman to show that that which was food for comment and criticism so severe in days gone by, is now a matter of indifference to the hon. gentleman, even though it is exaggerated a hundred fold.

Let me now, Mr. Speaker, deal with the expenditure on a per capita basis. I am not objecting to fair and even liberal expenditure. We have a young and growing country, which needs to be developed, but I must say that a good deal of public money in this country is not used for very wise purposes and not expended in a very statesmanlike way. In making the comparisons which I do to-day, I wish to be understood as not carping at fair and reasonable expenditure, because I am always willing and ready to support the government in its expenditures, so long as they are made on some systematic plan and for some wise purpose, in the true interests of our country. But it is only right that I should bring to the attention of the country, in these times of growing trade, increasing revenues and prosperity, the fact that our expenditure is also increasing by leaps and bounds; and we may well bear in mind the words which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, uttered only two or three sessions ago, that we cannot always expect to have these prosperous times, but must look for lean years in the future,

years when the public revenue will not be by any means abundant. Now, the per capita expenditure, computed from the year 1896 to the present time, shows as follows. And I may say in passing, that the estimate of population for the several years has been based upon a comparison of the census of 1891 with the census of 1901, by methods which, I think, give fair and accurate results:

PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE.

Year.	Population.	Expenditure.	Per Capita.
1896.. ..	5,070,000	\$41,702,383	\$ 8 22
1897.. ..	5,120,000	42,972,756	8 39
1898.. ..	5,175,000	45,334,281	8 76
1899.. ..	5,230,000	51,542,635	9 85
1900.. ..	5,285,000	52,717,467	9 98
1901.. ..	5,340,000	57,982,866	10 88
1902.. ..	5,410,000	63,970,780	11 82

The result of this is that, under the Liberal administration, our expenditure has increased about 53 per cent, our per capita expenditure, about 44 per cent and our population about 6½ per cent. What a text this would have been for my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). How he could deal with this subject now if he were inspired with the same sentiments he expressed so vigorously from 1878 to 1896. I have to express again the regret to which I have given voice before, that we could not have the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce come across the floor—just temporarily, of course, just for a couple of hours—and deal with the circumstances which face us to-day as he used to do in other times.

It will not be out of place for me to do as I have done before and to give to the House and the country an analysis of the increase of the expenditure of the various departments of the government from 1896 up to the present time. In every instance we find a substantial increase, and, in some cases at least, we find an increase, which I think, should give to some of us, and especially to economists like the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, food for very much thought: