

words with reference to the National Policy. I quoted them from the Minister of Finance, who applied them to the revenues. The hon. gentleman can use them if he likes. I would be willing to maintain them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I accept the correction, but most assuredly, the hon. gentleman claimed it as a great triumph of the National Policy, that when he left office in 1896 he was only \$360,000 short; although he had cooked accounts to bring that about. I cannot be mistaken in that. If I am, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who holds the speech in his hands will correct me.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither of you can prove that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Now, Sir, what are the actual facts of this triumph of the National Policy? In 1894 they had a deficit of about \$1,250,000; in 1895 they had a deficit of \$4,000,000, or thereabouts; which, by certain methods and means which I propose to enlarge upon a little later, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had succeeded, he says, in reducing to \$360,000 in 1896.

I will give the House a brief history of what the National Policy did for us, and I advise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to remember it and ponder on it. When I last had the honour of addressing this House as Finance Minister in 1878, the total expenditure of Canada was \$23,500,000, and in 1895, after seventeen years of the National Policy, the total expenditure of Canada was \$38,100,000, in round numbers. In other words, we had added very nearly \$15,000,000 to our annual expenditure and taxation in the period of seventeen years. During that same period, as the hon. gentleman well knows, the total increase of the population of Canada was scantily 40,000 per annum. Forty thousand people a year with all the immigrants thrown in was added to our population, and \$1,000,000 a year nearly were added to our public expenditure under the fostering influence of the National Policy from 1878 to 1895. I purposely exclude the year of 1896 and for good reasons, and I desire to call the attention of the House to the justice of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with respect to 1896. That hon. gentleman claimed great credit because the expenditure was reduced to \$36,950,000 in 1896, and I shall call the attention of the House to two or three important facts in that connection. For a very considerable period anterior to 1896, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had been gradually creeping up with the expenditure at the rate of something like half a million dollars a year. Here are the figures:

Expenditure in—

|              |              |
|--------------|--------------|
| 1890.....    | \$36,343,000 |
| 1891.....    | 36,705,000   |
| 1892-93..... | 36,814,000   |
| 1894.....    | 37,580,000   |
| 1895.....    | 38,132,000   |

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Then, he suddenly drops to \$37,000,000 in 1896. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for 1897, as it may be remembered, brought down main estimates to this House involving an expenditure of \$38,300,000, and he had besides in his desk supplementary estimates chargeable to consolidated fund, to the tune of \$3,180,000, making altogether \$41,500,000 between supplementaries and main estimates. The hon. gentleman, when it suits him, is fond of averages, and let him take these three. First, the actual expenditure for 1895, second, the actual expenditure for 1896, and third, his own estimates with supplementaries included for 1897; and what do we get? Sir, we get an average annual expenditure for the three years of \$39,150,000.

Now, I would like to ask this House: what would they say to a railroad manager who in bringing down the accounts of a great company for the year 1895 should have brought down charges to the tune of \$38,100,000; for the year 1896 to have brought down charges of \$37,000,000, and for the succeeding year, charges to the amount of \$41,500,000. I certainly do not want to hurt the feelings of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), but I would say, that most of his shareholders would regard this as a very dexterous specimen of the art of cooking accounts. That is precisely what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did. If you choose to analyse his expenditure for 1896, you will see that he did not effect an honest reduction on the expenditure of 1895. What he did was this. He saved nearly half a million on militia estimates by the very simple expedient of giving the militia no drill that year, and thus making the bulk of the expenditure on that branch of the service very nearly useless. He saved another half million dollars by starving the public works of the country, by refusing, and by ordering—as I am informed by my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte)—the people in the Public Works Department not to spend any money.

Now, if those had been genuine savings; if they had been savings that could have been maintained, I would give the hon. gentleman all the credit for them. But they were savings that could not be maintained, and he knew it. He himself had spent nearly \$1,550,000 for militia in 1895, and he was going to spend \$1,600,000 for militia in 1897, according to his own main estimates. What right has anybody to pretend, that it is an effective and permanent saving to spend \$1,100,000 less in 1896? Sir, it was simply a case of carrying over for political reasons, to the year 1897, expenditures which should properly have been charged to 1896.

And in the case of public works, I would just present to the House a short sketch of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did. Five years ago he required \$1,927,000 for his public works; four years ago he required \$2,000,000 (and I am giving the actual