

The total trade also is one of the means whereby we measure the prosperity of the country. I have here a statement of the total exports and imports :—

TOTAL TRADE.

Year.	
1868..	\$131,027,532
1870..	148,387,829
1875..	200,957,262
1880..	174,401,205
1885..	198,179,847
1890..	218,607,390
1895..	224,420,485
1900..	381,517,236
1901..	386,903,157
1902..	423,910,441

These figures include total exports and total imports which in turn include coin and bullion.

My next statement is one showing the imports for consumption and the exports :—

STATEMENT OF MERCHANDISE IMPORTED (FOR HOME CONSUMPTION) AND EXPORTED.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1868..	\$ 67,090,159	\$ 49,739,998
1870..	66,902,074	62,608,814
1875..	117,408,568	74,628,212
1880..	69,900,542	83,336,197
1885..	99,755,775	84,263,164
1890..	111,682,573	91,387,295
1895..	100,675,891	106,013,394
1900..	172,506,878	177,776,944
1901..	177,700,694	194,509,143
1902..	196,480,190	209,970,864

These figures include merchandise only, (coin and bullion excluded). Equally satisfactory is a statement of our exports continued to home products.

TOTAL EXPORTS—HOME PRODUCE.

Year.	
1868....	\$ 45,543,177
1870....	56,081,192
1875....	67,490,393
1880....	70,096,191
1885....	76,183,518
1890....	82,335,514
1895....	99,528,351
1900....	163,510,790
1901....	177,431,386
1902....	196,019,763

In connection with the statement of surpluses which I have read, I think, having reference to some criticism which occasionally appears in the press, that I should offer a further observation. It ought not to be necessary to make any explanation concerning these surpluses, but sometimes we

see in the public press, and even in journals from which I would expect greater intelligence and greater fairness, the statement that the surpluses which the government have been able to set forth, are unreal, because they do not cover all classes of expenditures. Now, it ought to be well understood by hon. gentleman, and it will be understood by the older members of the House, that the distinction which is observed in our public accounts between capital expenditure and expenditure chargeable to income, is not a discovery which I have made. It is not an invention of mine. It has existed in the public accounts from the beginning. It has properly existed; and I hope it will be clearly understood that in that respect there is no change. The public accounts in this respect are kept as they always have been kept. There is a proper distinction. Sometimes it may be difficult to draw the line, but as respects the greater part of our expenditures on capital account there is a properly drawn line between capital expenditures and expenditures chargeable to income. However that may be, we have simply carried on the same method of keeping accounts that our predecessors have followed.

An hon. MEMBER. Except the bounty on iron.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad my hon. friend has reminded me of that, but I would have spoken of it in any case. If you look at the statements which appeared under the head of capital and the statements to-day, you will find that the only new item of any considerable amount is that respecting the bounty on iron. Now, the former method of dealing with that bounty was one with which we need not fear a comparison. What was the former method of keeping accounts with regard to the bounties on iron? We had the moneys deducted from the customs revenues, they were classed as a refund of moneys. Considering that not a penny went to the treasury, it would be difficult to understand how they could be properly classed as a refund. There never was any money paid into the treasury in this connection; but year after year the payment of these bounties, for some reason that I have never