

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think any was spent. It was the fashion to make appropriations and leave them dangling before the people.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend say when the first one was?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend distresses his soul about an appropriation of \$8,000 in the village of Victoriaville with a population of 2,200, but is quite prepared to vote for a public building in the little village of Marysville, which has less than 900 inhabitants.

If you have a population of 5,000,000, you can bear an expenditure of, say, \$40,000,000, which is \$8 a head. If you have a population of 6,000,000 you could bear an expenditure \$48,000,000, and there would be no greater burden on the people. The question is, what is the per capita expenditure? If I had the time, I would like to go into this and show that the expenditure per head of the population has been well kept down. We had \$7.39 per head in 1898, chargeable to consolidated account. The year just closed the total expenditure will be about \$7.77, an apparent increase, but if you take out of that the Yukon expenditure, which is entirely exceptional, and the additional expenditure on the Intercolonial Railroad—both of which are profitable investments, bringing back more money into the treasury than was paid out—leave out these two exceptional expenditures, and you will find that the expenditure of 1899 is approximately \$7.31, which is lower than the usual expenditure of the late Government for a long period of time. I do not propose to keep the attention of the House fur-

ther, but if time permitted I would be able to give at every point most ample vindication of the expenditure which this Government has made. In this growing time, the demand of the people is not for niggardly economy. That is true economy which adapts itself to the new and growing conditions of the country. If the people of Canada, above all, if the Liberals of Canada, could be shown that there had been expenditure made through corrupt means and for corrupt purposes, they would be prepared to condemn the Government. But, so long as these expenditures can be shown to have been made for the development of the country—honestly and faithfully made—I have no fear of the criticism which the public will bring to bear upon us for these expenditures. The hon. gentleman to-day ventured, Sir, to read us a lecture upon public morality, upon faith and honour. Surely, the hon. gentleman was not serious; surely, with the record of the Ministry of which he was a member, surely, with the record of the events in which he was a prominent figure, he will not venture to call public men in question on the point of their public morality, or of faith, or honour. The hon. gentleman sat in a Ministry, and acted with a party, which for a quarter of a century pursued a policy of plunder, a policy of corruption. Why, they do not deny it. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), in this House, when reference has been made to these matters, says: Oh, but these men were punished. True, they were punished. They were expelled from office, and will remain out of office a long time. But, when they come forward and talk of faith, and honour, and public morality, we have some reason, I think, to call attention to the position in which they stand.

Average.

8

6,563,075

2,186,321

having extr- with a re-addition to ), but very

like to call the question

ation? Do to say that ty \$1,000,-

E. I say the year is are not in a com- with appro- \$6,500,000, opposite, 00. I say is a state- long effect when the s we have lic works

o the vote ear 1895, at the later that the

as spent?