



6-7-26

Political Pointers

No. 1.

A. H. H. H.
1890



HON. SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT

Minister of Trade and Commerce

CANADA

NATIONAL LIBRARY
CANADA
BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

50

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

AT MASSEY MUSIC HALL

TORONTO

AUGUST 24TH 1899.

Sir Richard Cartwright on rising to speak was received with a waving of handkerchiefs, huzzas and the singing of "He's a Jolly Good Fellow," followed by three cheers and a tiger. Then an enthusiastic young man on the platform shouted, "Everybody stand up," and the whole audience rose and cheered again. This gave rise to an interruption from the audience, someone shouting, "What are you going to do with the sixty-nine millions?" which elicited from Sir Richard the retort: "Mr. President, ladies and gentleman, I trust to be able to give the gentleman all satisfaction before I conclude—that is to say, if he is one of those who is capable of being satisfied.

Sir Richard then proceeded:—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I would be very insensible indeed if I were not deeply moved by the reception you have been kind enough to bestow upon me, and by the sight of the magnificent audience whom I see assembled here to-night. I am here to-night partly for the purpose of discharging an old obligation to the club of which you are the President (The Cartwright Club of Parkdale), and partly because it has appeared to me that now that the heat and smoke of the session have vanished away it might be as well to take advantage of the opportunity to place before the citizens of Toronto, and also before the people of Canada, some few simple facts which I think will tend to dissipate certain needless alarms that our friends the enemy

appear to entertain as to the policy and proceedings of the present Government. Mr. President, there is an old saying that onlookers, at any rate if those onlookers know anything of the game, see more than those who play. (Laughter.) Now, for a period of some three years back I have myself been rather a badly crippled man, and in consequence have been to a certain extent occupying the role of onlooker. In that capacity two or three things have struck me rather forcibly. First of all, the attitude of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition at the present moment appears to me, looking back on a period of some thirty years, as a rather curious attitude for an Opposition to take.

No Policy, No Leader.

Our present Opposition have no policy, Mr. President. (Laughter.) Our present Opposition have practically no leader, Mr. President. (Laughter and cheers.) It is not, to do him justice, that my old acquaintance, Sir Charles Tupper is not vigorous enough. For a man of his years I am bound to say that he displays wonderful vigor—(hear, hear)—but, unhappily, Sir Charles Tupper appears to have very little authority over his followers. Sir Charles is sometimes wiser than his followers; but I have observed that whenever he so far forgets himself as to show that he is more rational than they he is promptly sat upon and turned down. (Laughter and cheers.) Now, I have noticed also that Sir Charles Tupper brings forward one very grave and serious accusation against the present Government. Stripped of his numerous adjectives, boiled down to the finest point, Sir Charles' chief charge against the Liberal leaders of the present day is that they are as bad as he was himself. (Laughter.) Now, gentlemen, I do not in the least degree desire that you or anybody should underestimate the great gravity of that accusation. (Laughter.) It is a very serious charge against us; that I frankly admit—(laughter)—but, being very serious, I venture to say that it requires very strong corroborative evidence, and more than Sir Charles' own testimony. Then, too, it is antecedently improbable, if I may say so. It may be, although I would be very sorry to think it, it may be that the Liberal leaders are naturally as bad as Sir Charles Tupper; but, then, Mr. President, they have not had the long practice. (Laughter.) The truth is that since Sir Charles has assumed the position he fills so well of leader of her Majesty's loyal Opposition in which position I wish him long life—(loud and long-continued laughter)—for to my thinking the Liberal party

have no better friend in Canada than Sir Charles Tupper as leader of the Opposition—(laughter)—I say it has occurred to me as an onlooker that Sir Charles, like several other distinguished persons, has a dual personality. When I listen to Sir Charles Tupper thundering against extravagance and denouncing corruption, I cannot but feel that I am listening to Sir Charles Jekyil, as leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, and that Sir Charles Jekyil is virtuously indignant and probably entirely oblivious of the very pretty pranks which he, in his other capacity of Sir Charles Hyde, when Lord High Commissioner and Minister of Railways and Canals, was in the habit of perpetrating in time gone by. (Hear, hear and laughter.) One thing I do feel sure of: that it is greatly for the good of Canada, and probably for the soul's health of Sir Charles Tupper, that he should continue to fill the role of Sir Charles Jekyil, leader of Her Majesty's Opposition. (Hear, hear and laughter.) Now, gentlemen, there are a great many subjects, several of which have been alluded to by my friend Mr. Archibald Campbell, member of the House of Commons, on which I could desire to address you tonight; but I think I will probably best consult your wishes and probably be of most service to some of you if I confine myself on the present occasion to one subject, at any rate chiefly to one subject, and I do that partly because it is one of very great importance to the people of Canada and partly because it is one upon which I have been often quoted, and especially appealed to by the Opposition newspapers and the Opposition leaders in Parliament and out of it.

Charges of Extravagance.

They are at the present moment terribly exercised over the alleged reckless extravagances of the Liberal party, and the inconsistencies of the Liberals, myself particularly, in pardoning and condoning those extravagances. I will recite briefly the charges which they prefer against us. They say that when the late Government went out of office their annual expenditure in 1896 was \$37,000,000, which is perfectly true, while we demand for the services for the year 1900, \$43,000,000, which again is perfectly true. They also say that we, in the year 1896, and before the year 1896, frequently declared that \$38,000,000, or even \$37,000,000, under the then conditions of Canada, was more than the people should be called upon to pay, which is also perfectly true. Now, I desire to state once for all, that my position is this. That what the

Liberal party said in 1896, under the then existing conditions, was perfectly right and true. What they propose to do in 1900, under conditions which now exist, is likewise prudent and wise. (Applause.) That is the point that I propose to demonstrate to you to-night. When I look back to the year 1896, and consider the conditions under which Canada was then placed, I find it difficult to realize that only six and thirty months have passed since that time. There are occasions, and this is one of them, in which the progress of a country in three years is as great as for the preceding thirty years. Such a case occurs perhaps once in a generation or a century, but has literally been carried out in Canada within the last three years. (Applause.) I do not pretend to say that such a state of affairs was wholly and entirely because of the advent to power of the Liberal party. But I do say that we would be worse than fools if we did not see it, and worse than cowards if we did not recognize and act upon it. (Applause.) And I think I shall be able to prove to you before I sit down that all these accusations made against us of wasteful, wilful and reckless extravagance are not only utterly misplaced in the mouths of those who bring the charges but are of themselves absolutely devoid of foundation.

A Retrospect.

Let me pause for a moment to recall to your minds what sort of a position Canada was in three years ago. In 1896, when the Liberal party objected, and with good cause, to the great expenditure, I doubt if since Canada became a nation, if since the period of Confederation, there ever was a time in which there was such need of economy as there was in that year. We were confronted with a tremendous deficit for 1895, our total volume of trade and commerce had fallen to a low ebb, and the population was scarcely increasing at the rate of one of the oldest European kingdoms. Further, as you know all of you, and particularly if you have had anything to do with the business affairs of this Province, there was scarcely a district in which land and farm property was saleable. I would have you to consider for one moment the alteration that has taken place in this three years, because, as I said, I will give you proof in detail that when I alleged that the past three years had done as much for the prosperity of Canada as the preceding thirty years, I was not indulging in any exaggerated rhetorical flourish, but was simply stating the actual facts as recorded in our authentic and published records. Before I proceed to that, however, I will just say one word on another point as to which my words

have been frequently quoted, namely, as to the corruption which in former times I alleged was likely to take place from profuse expenditures of public moneys. I have to say to you that I think the statements I made have been justified up to the hilt. (Applause.) I am not going to dwell to-night on the policy of our predecessors on the subject of extravagant expenditure, of Quebec docks, of Curran bridges, of Tay canals, of subsidies to the St. John and Temiscuata railways, and scores of others besides. I am willing enough to leave them alone. I am not going to refer to the iniquities of which Mr. McGreevy was made the confident and scapegoat, for the last twenty years. I am willing to allow the dead past to bury its dead, and do not desire to revive those matters again beyond calling your attention to the fact that the development which took place from 1891 outwards show superabundantly to any who choose to examine the records for themselves how affairs had been conducted from 1878 to 1896.

Comparative Tests.

That record will show that I am amply justified in the fullest detail, and if any of these gentlemen desire further information it can be supplied as fully and minutely as even in those promised documents in which the late Sir James Edgar based his indictment of Sir A. Caron. But what I propose to do and what I prefer to do to-night is not to revive all the old scandals but rather to explain the actual facts of our position to friend and foe, here or elsewhere. I propose to take three separate tests which I think will commend themselves to every business man in this country and this audience and to every other person who has the interests of Canada at heart. I propose to compare the actual expenditures of the two Governments for the years 1895 and 1898, which is the last year for which we have full and detailed records. And here I may tell you that I utterly refuse to accept the statements of the expenditures in 1896 as being fair evidence of the expenditure of the people of Canada, and for this reason: In 1896 the late Government and Mr. Foster for reasons best known to themselves—(laughter)—cooked our accounts. They did great injury to the public service by reducing the expenditures in various branches, not permanently, as was afterwards shown, but for a temporary purpose. The motive was to conceal the enormous deficit which would confront them if they did not curtail the ordinary expenditure in some fashion, and this was how they did it: First of all, they refused to allow the militia to be drilled, making it impossible for instruction to be carried out by

refusing to give them any annual pay. Now, as everyone knows, that was a very serious step, a militia undrilled is almost as bad as none at all, and the result of that false economy was to a great extent to demoralize one-half of that force. Such an action might have been justifiable under another condition. It might have been wise and expedient for them to have reduced the militia force had they undertaken the responsibility of that. There might, I say, have been some excuse for them in taking such action. But as every man who has had experience in militia or public affairs knows you might as well wipe out your expenditure altogether as to reduce it to the demoralization of a branch of the service. (Applause.) The other expedient they followed was like unto it. As you know, we have scattered about this Dominion an enormous number of public works. Many of these are on the coast of the Atlantic, subjected to the utmost severities of weather and storms. If you neglect to repair them you inevitably expose them to the risk of going to utter wreck and ruin, rendering it necessary for your successor to expend much larger sums in proportion for ordinary repairs than would have been the case had they been properly looked after at the right time. Well, the expenditure for this branch of the work was cut down to the very bone, leaving greater charges for their successors, and this was the other expedient to which Mr. Foster had recourse for the purpose of producing a balance on the right side. I refuse, therefore, to accept as correct the comparison of the expenditure for 1896, but will take the cash expenditure for the year 1895, an average year of Conservative rule, and compare with it our cash expenditure for 1898. That will be the first test by which I will ask you to judge of the comparative prudence and economy by which the affairs of Canada have been administered.

Estimates Compared.

Then, sir, for a second test I will take Mr. Foster's estimates for the year 1897, and I will compare those estimates with the estimates which we have lately brought down for the year 1900, and I will invite your serious attention to the results which will become apparent to you; and for a third test I will apply what is known as the per capita test—that is to say, I will show how, measured by the present population of Canada, our expenditure compares with that incurred by our opponents. Now, sir, I think that with these three tests there will be very little difficulty indeed for anybody who so desires to form an accurate opinion of the truth or the untruth of the charges which have been preferred against us. And here I

would like to ask my friends who are here present, or some of our opponents who may be present, one or two of whom I have heard inquiring a little while ago as what we were going to do with the fifty-eight or fifty-nine millions that we are asking for the expenditure of 1900. Sir, I would like to ask these gentlemen, I would like to ask any man here, what they suppose is the total addition to the fixed charges of Canada which will be made when our expenditures for 1900 are completed. Now, you are aware, you have all heard, that we have run riot; that our expenditure is the most monstrous ever known or ever heard of. You have all heard that no such outlay was ever contemplated, ever thought of, ever dreamt of by a Conservative Administration, as that to which we have committed ourselves. Sir, how much, again I ask, do this audience suppose has been added to the fixed charges of Canada between 1897 and 1900? Do you suppose that a million has been added? Do you suppose that three-quarters of a million has been added? Do you suppose that half a million has been added? Is there no gentleman here who would like to venture a guess as to what the total addition in those three years has been, basing the computation on the sum demanded by Mr. Foster in his estimates of 1897, and on the same demanded by Mr. Fielding for the estimates of 1900.* No man is willing to offer a guess. Well, sir, perhaps our friends are prudent. Sir, I will tell you what the total addition made by this most extravagant Government to the fixed charges of Canada has been between the year 1897 and the year 1900, taking as the standard Mr. Foster's calculations in the first year and Mr. Fielding's calculations in the last. Ladies and gentlemen, it amounts to just \$65,000—(loud cheers)—or, I believe, a little over one cent a head of our population. (Renewed cheers.) I will add this for your further information: that in those three years, if the information which has been laid before us by our sticians is to be relied upon in the least, if the returns of our Immigration Department are to be relied upon in the least, in 1897 the fixed charge for interest would have amounted to 2.11 per head. In 1900, allowing for \$65,000 added, the fixed charge will amount to \$2 per head. (Cheers.) As I say, you have heard from the *Toronto Mail*, you have heard from the *Montreal Gazette*, you have heard from the *Montreal Star* and all

*The charge for interest is estimated by Mr. Foster in his estimates for 1897 at.....	\$10,758,945
Mr. Fielding's estimate for 1900 is	\$10,824,587
Difference is exactly	\$65,642

the little dogs of the party—(laughter)—how vast and monstrous our expenditures have been. They are horrified, they are appalled, they are terror-stricken at the idea that over and above all that we have demanded for ordinary expenditure we demand a matter of six or seven millions on capital account for the purpose of completing our canal and railway expenditure, and that we are actually asking for six or seven millions more for the purpose of extending railways in various parts of this country, notably, I may be allowed to add, in those parts of Ontario which are known as New Ontario and which are now in process of development.

A voice—How much is Quebec getting ?

Sir Richard Cartwright—Quebec is getting for railway subsidies, to the best of my recollection, a third part as much as Ontario is getting. (Loud cheers.) And now, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard, as I say, how large and monstrous these expenditures were. Would it surprise you to learn that if you deduct the cross entries caused by the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and by the expenditure for the Yukon and of the sinking fund, that is to say, the amount of the sinking fund which we pay, and which our predecessors did not pay, that Mr. Foster's estimates for 1897 were almost exactly and identically equal to Mr. Fielding's for 1900. I shall give you the details presently. I would just make one further remark. These estimates of Mr. Foster—which I will give you, as I say, in a few minutes—were brought down when? They were brought down in the early part of 1896. They were brought down under circumstances which, if ever, should have imposed upon a Government the necessity of proceeding with extreme prudence and caution. We had just closed 1895 with a deficit of over \$4,000,000. There was not the slightest doubt that there had been, up to 1896, very little growth of our population since the census of 1891. We had very heavy liabilities to meet, of which I note these papers that I have quoted take no notice whatsoever. The volume of our trade and commerce was very considerably reduced, and altogether the outlook was as gloomy as it well could be. Now, sir, under those conditions, these journalists and those whom they represent would have had, had they so seen fit, the most ample cause for the language which they use to-day. They would have had very good ground indeed for complaining that the late Government were throwing all wholesome restraint to the winds; that they were reckless; that they were imprudent; that they were piling up liabilities which they saw no way to meet.

But I put it to you, was there one whimper then; did they find breath to condemn one single act of the late Government? (Cheers.) They are in hysterics now over the proposition which we make.

A Surplus of \$5,000,000.

And under what circumstances are we making it? Why, sir, to-day, as against a deficit of four millions in 1895, we will have a surplus of at least \$5,000,000. (Cheers.) Our gross income for 1899 will be forty-six millions at least, as against thirty-four millions in 1895. Our population, according to the best estimate that it is possible to make, is at least half a million more than it was in 1895.* (Cheers.) The volume of trade of our people, all told, had risen well nigh one hundred millions since 1895. (Renewed cheers.) The total income of our people, as far as it is possible to estimate it, is held by those who are best entitled to form a judgment upon the point to be fully fifty millions a year more than it was in 1895. Yet, gentlemen, the men who in 1896 could see nothing to condemn on the part of the Conservative Government in bringing down the enormous estimates which they brought down, or were prepared to bring down; now, under the circumstances that I have detailed, can see nothing to excuse a Reform Government for asking for an expenditure, every penny of which, I believe, will prove to be thoroughly fruitful and beneficial to the people of Canada. (Cheers.) Now, gentlemen, I will give you the details of the statement which I have just made. I have here beside me a very interesting little

*NOTE.—The relative population of 1885 and of 1900 is, of course, a matter of estimate. But it is well known that the alleged increase of population from 1881 to 1891 was scarcely 50,000 a year and that there was very grave reason to believe that the census returns of 1891 fraudulently exaggerated the number of people. It is also known that the exodus continued more or less up to 1895 and that immigration to Canada during the years from 1891 to 1895 was very small indeed. Since 1896 all this has changed. Except possibly from some portions of Quebec there has been no exodus. Large numbers of immigrants have come to Canada and remained here. Above all, for the first time a strong counter current has set in from the United States to Canada, and on the whole there is a great concurrence of evidence to show that the population is increasing at the rate of 100,000 to 125,000 a year, which after all is about the normal rate at which it might be expected to increase, even without immigration, in a new country and is less than the rate of growth in former years in Canada or in the United States. An addition of 500,000 people, therefore, between 1895 and 1900 is a very moderate computation, though it must be borne in mind that the frauds committed in taking the census of 1891 may considerably affect the nominal results of the census of 1901.

document. As perhaps some of you are aware it is customary always for a Government to bring down supplementary estimates, and these supplementary estimates for many years back have usually been of very considerable magnitude. Now, sir, in 1896, I appealed very frequently to Mr. Foster to lay his supplementary estimates on the table, but I appealed in vain. It is quite true Mr. Foster could not get his main estimates through, and therefore he had good technical pretext for refusing to bring his supplementary estimates down, but we were perfectly aware that these supplementary estimates were under consideration. Those things were well known and well talked of in the corridors of Parliament. They leaked out in a thousand ways. More than that, during the elections of 1896 we found ourselves confronted on many hustings by statements that the Conservative Government were prepared to do this and that and t'other, and when the speakers were asked for their authority they quoted the supplementary estimates which Mr. Foster had been prepared to bring down. Now, Sir, although Mr. Foster would not lay his estimates on the table, these estimates had been prepared. Unfortunately, a few copies remained extant. Still more unfortunately, one of these copies has fallen into my hands. (Laughter.) I have also Mr. Foster's main estimates, which amounted for the year 1897 to the sum of \$38,357,548. I have here Mr. Foster's supplementary estimates, which amounted to the sum of \$4,660,000. I have here Mr. Foster's statement that he would require for capital expenditure the sum of \$2,819,000. I have here, too, the list of the railway subsidies which were brought down to the tune of \$2,772,000. I have here a list of the Prince Edward Island Railway, seven branches, aggregating 127 miles, which from past experience I am very sure under the management of Sir Charles Tupper would never have been constructed for less than two and a half millions. I have here also the statement that they were willing to give to the Crow's Nest Railway \$1,650,000 and lend it a large sum besides, and I have likewise their own declaration that if they could they would have added \$750,000 a year to our expenditure for a fast Atlantic service.

Conservatives Asked \$53,000,000.

Now, sir, if you will remember that the cross entries to which I alluded, for the Yukon, for the Intercolonial Railway, for the sinking fund—all of which, mind you, go back into our pockets, which cost the people of Canada nothing—when you recollect that

these would mean three millions more for which these gentlemen were not called upon to provide, you will see that if you add together the various sums which I have just given you Mr. Foster and his friends were prepared in 1896 for the service of 1897, with the additions which I have stated to you, to demand \$53,490,000 for the public service. Deduct from Mr. Fielding's estimates those three items which I have mentioned and there is hardly a million difference between what Mr. Fielding asks for with a surplus of five million and what Mr. Foster asked for with a deficit of four millions staring him in the face. (Loud cheers.)

A voice—So much for thirty years of robbery.

Sir Richard Cartwright—I have another interesting fact to lay before you, and that added to the other will suffice to show you what admirable ground these gentlemen have for accusing the present Government of wilful and wasteful extravagance. I have here comparative statements of the ordinary expenditure of Canada for the years 1895 and 1898. Well, sir, I find that (passing over what is known as the uncontrollable expenditure) in the year 1895 the late Government expended for the administration of justice \$755,000. We expended in 1898 \$765,000, being an increase of about \$10,000. I find under the head of civil government that in 1895 the late Government expended \$1,422,000. We expended \$1,399,000, or just \$23,000 less. I find in the matter of fisheries that they expended \$443,000; we expended \$441,000. I find in the matter of immigration and quarantine that they expended in round numbers about \$300,000. We expended in round numbers \$400,000, or \$100,000 more. I find for Indian expenses \$955,000 in the one case and \$952,000 in ours. I find for legislation that they expended \$941,000 and that we expended \$729,000, being over \$200,000 less. I find for lighthouse, coast services, they expended \$475,000 we expended \$474,000. I find for militia and defence they expended in 1895 \$1,574,000; we expended \$1,514,000. I find for the mounted police that they expended \$646,000, and that we expended, including an enormous expenditure in the Yukon, \$865,000. I find for ocean and river services they expended \$205,000; we expended \$140,000. I find for penitentiaries they expended \$449,000; we expended \$366,000. I find for public works—on which, be it remembered, we are supposed to be peculiarly extravagant, or rather Mr. Tarte is—that in 1895 they expended \$1,742,000, and that we expended \$1,701,000. I find for railways and canals chargeable to income they expended \$252,000; we expended \$190,000.

Those constitute, gentlemen, as you will see, the great bulk of what is known as controllable expenditures.

A voice—What about prohibition?

Sir Richard Cartwright—That came in this year. (Cheers.) Now, gentlemen, I want to point out to you what all this amounts to. Remember we are charged with being a most extravagant Government. We are charged with frittering away your money and getting no return for it

Expenditure Contrasted.

I want to contrast the actual expenditure in a year in which it was tolerably honestly made, in 1895, with our expenditure in 1898—three years later, be it remembered, with a much larger population to serve. They expended in 1895, \$38,132,000. We expended in 1898, \$38,832,000, being an excess of \$700,000. Now, ladies and gentlemen, how was that incurred? First of all is the sinking fund, which, as everyone of you knows, goes directly out of one pocket into the other. We expended \$357,000 more than they had expended in 1895. For agricultural and subsidies for the purpose of promoting our trade we expended \$105,000 more than they did. For immigration we expended \$65,000 more with very excellent results. For the Yukon territory we expended \$800,000, in round numbers, and for railways and canals we expended \$345,000 more than our predecessors had done, having on our hands, as pointed out to you, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway and other charges of the kind. Those were our extra expenditures, amounting to \$1,672,000, against, as you will observe, scarcely more than \$700,000 excess. But for that we obtained extra receipts to the following amounts:—From the Yukon, \$1,100,000; for interest on investments caused by the investment of the sinking fund, \$177,000; for railway receipts credited to the extension to Montreal, \$282,000. So that of the \$1,672,000 that we expended, we returned to the public treasury, directly, the sum of \$1,559,000, and if you choose to deduct these various items on both sides you will see that in all other respects we were performing the same services that these gentlemen had performed in 1895, and that we were doing it collectively for about a million less than they were doing in 1895. (Loud cheers.)

A voice.—What are you going to do about the prohibition vote?

Sir Richard Cartwright.—I wonder if that is a matter of deep personal interest to my friend who interrupted me? (Great laughter.) Now, I have shown you as succinctly as I could—and I

must apologize to you for inflicting this rather lengthy array of figures—I have shown to you, I think, reasonably, clearly and distinctly, two things: first of all, that in 1897 Mr. Foster came down with propositions involving an expenditure equal to that demanded by us for 1900, although the conditions of the country at that time were undoubtedly such as should have called for great care and great prudence on his part. I have shown you in the second place that, service for service, the work for which they demanded \$38,132,000 in 1895 was performed in 1898 for about a million less than they found necessary. (Cheers.) I desire now to apply the other and the last test, and that is the test of how this bears on the population of the country.

Taxation in Relation to Population.

I think I am correct in saying that no man who has watched the movement of population will deny for one moment that up to 1896 our population had increased in a very small degree, certainly not more than it had done in the last years of the decade from 1881 to 1891. If that be so, our total population in 1897 could by no possibility have exceeded 5,100,000. From that time there is every reason to believe that our population has been increasing at least double or treble as fast as it increased before 1896. No man who has travelled much about this country, no man who has watched the growth of our towns and cities, no man who has watched the growth of the Northwest in particular but must admit that there has been a very large influx of population in these last three years, more than there was at any other previous time. Now, sir, if you apply that test you will find that in 1898 our population was cer-

NOTE.—Increase of annual income. This is estimated at 50 millions gross. It is probable that between increased production and rise in prices the gross increase of our farmers alone has increased by that sum. *Canadian exports* in 1895 were barely 103 millions. In 1898 they had risen to 145 millions. This alone would show an increase of gross income of 42 millions, and then the other additional sources of income. The Klondyke in one sense is a thing apart, but yet it adds very considerably in one way or other to the gross income of the people. So do the exploration and development of the various mines. So do the additional freights earned by Canadian vessels and various other matters.

tainly 300,000 or 400,000 more than it was in 1895, and that in 1900 it will in all probability be at least 300,000 more than it was in 1897.

A voice.—It ought to be 25,000,000 at least. (Applause.)

Canada's Great Mistake.

Sir Richard—And in all human probability if the people of Canada had not turned out honest and sagacious Alexander MacKenzie in 1878 it would have been on the high road to that figure. (Loud cheers.)

Sir, there is no more painful chapter of Canadian history than that revealed by the census returns from 1881 to 1891—throughout the time, if you like, when the Conservative party had full opportunity of showing what it could do for Canada. (Hear, hear.) What did they do in that time? Sir, during that interval about a million of people who ought to have settled in Canada, either natives of Canada or immigrants who had come to Canada, fled from our shores to take up their residence in the United States, and swell and strengthen the resources of an alien power. (Cheers.)

A voice—Why doesn't Laurier enforce the alien labor law?

Other voices—"Sit down!" "Shut up!"

Sir Richard—Now I think the tide has turned; I think there is good ground for believing that the tide has turned, and turned for good—(hear, hear)—that we will not again see the spectacle of a million of Canadians expatriated, seeking employment in the United States, but that, on the other hand, from the northern and northwestern States and largely from the sons of the very men who left our country some years ago the tide of population is flowing and rushing to fill up these vacant territories of ours in the north-west regions, and that in the course of a few years instead of as at former times finding our population increasing at a smaller rate than that of the oldest and most thickly settled European country you will see we will resume the ratio of progress which prevailed up to 1878. (Cheers.)

Recent Growth of Population.

However, sir, I was desirous of pointing out to you that measured by the influx of population—which is one of the fairest ways that we can measure it—the expenditure of this country had been a fair average when you remember that a large amount of our so-called expenditure is purely and simply cross entries. The

growth of our population has far more than kept pace with the increased expenditure, such as it has been. And here let me say to you that there are two ways in which economists and statesmen can increase the progress of a country and diminish the burdens of a people. If you choose, and if the circumstances warrant it, you may succeed sometimes in reducing the expenditure to a considerable extent, or you may—which is the wiser and more patriotic, the more manly and the better course—you may succeed in so increasing the number of contributors to the revenue that the burden in that way will be far less than it would be even if you succeeded in reducing the expenditure by a million or two.

Population Better than Parsimony.

Surely it must be evident to every man who will give the subject a second thought that it would be far better for Canada to have an expenditure of 40 or 42 millions a year to a population of six or seven millions than to reduce the expenditure to 35 millions, let us say, and retain our population of barely five millions here. (Cheers.) But, sir, as we are on this question of population, let me here say one thing, I have pointed out to you the extreme slowness of the growth of Canada according to population from 1881 to 1891. As probably most of you know, over whole Provinces of this Dominion there was no increase at all. In the Province of Ontario our increase was scarcely half of that which occurred between the years 1871 and 1881, and the same is true of the Province of Quebec. But, sir, we have every reason to believe that, bad as the record of the census was, that that census was cooked—that that census was a fraudulent census. I was myself present in Parliament, and I have here the record beside me, when Dr. Borden, the present Minister of Militia, rose in his place and gave the Government the names of fifty people in one single sub-division of Nova Scotia who had been absent from that country and citizens of the United States for periods ranging from five to twenty-one years. That was the way, sir, in which those records were prepared, and if in the census of 1881 and 1891 you find that the apparent growth is less than you might reasonably expect; if you find that the real number of the population is not what we have a right to expect it to be, not commensurate with the increase which we know now is taking place, you will be fully justified, in view of the action of the Government then in view of the fact that they entirely and utterly refused to take any steps whatever to investigate those proven frauds when brought to their attention by a member of Parliament on the floor of Parlia-

ment, you will know, gentlemen, to what to attribute it. But I myself have no doubt whatever that the same frauds that prevailed in Nova Scotia prevailed extensively over other portions of this Dominion.

NOTE.—Dr. F. W. Borden, M.P., for King's County, Nova Scotia, now Minister of Militia, speaking in the House of Commons, as reported in The Hansard of June 12th, 1894, said :—

“According to the census returns, the population of that county was 1,000 less in 1891 than in 1881. Now, it happened that a gentleman in my county had some doubts whether the figures returned by the census as the population of that county in 1891 were correct. He was satisfied that gross mis-statements had been made in certain sections of the county, and he took the trouble to investigate the matter by going around and calling upon a number of families and ascertaining who had been enumerated, and whether the persons returned as being then residents of those localities were really so, or had emigrated. Now, I have here the result, or a portion of the result, of that gentleman's investigations. I have a list of some fifty names, as to which I was asked to ascertain whether they were on the list returned by the enumerators for King's County or not. About a year and a half ago I saw the census commissioner here with reference to those names, and asked to be allowed to see the lists. He said he could not show me the list unless I took an oath that I would not divulge anything I there saw. I said that would not meet my purpose. He said: “If you will give me a list of the names, I will ascertain whether they are on the list or not.” I gave him the list of names which I have here, and in reply I received from him a letter, dated 8th June, 1892, to this effect :

MR. BORDEN,

We find all the names you gave me excepting Henry A. Palmer, in Medford, and Mrs. Peter Weaver, Blomidon. There are lots of Weavers, but not ‘Peter.’ She may be down under her own christian name.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

So that out of the fifty names, or thereabouts, which I submitted, it turned out, according to the evidence of the commissioner himself, that forty-eight were on the list. Now, I will submit a statement, showing where these people are who were returned by the census enumerators in 1891 as residents of King's County at that time. I have here a number of affidavits, which the gentleman to whom I have already referred, Mr. Samuel J. Kerr, obtained with reference to these names. I shall not now trouble the House by reading them, but I think the question is of sufficient importance to justify me in devoting at least a few moments to its discussion, because if the same kind of thing has been carried on generally throughout the Dominion the census returns are utterly worthless. I do not say that it has been confined to the last census. It may have been carried on under former censuses, and, if so, it is absolutely necessary that the Government and the country should understand it, and that measures should be taken before another census is taken to prevent any such fraudulent returns being made in the future. In the first place, I find a family of six people of the name of Morris, returned as residents of the Dominion of Canada, in the

County of King's, who have been absent in the United States, one for six years, another for nine years, another for two years, another for four years, another four years, and another for two years. The next is a family of five, who have been absent respectively, one and a half years, seventeen years, seven years, nine years and five years—absolutely residing in the United States, and never coming home except for a short visit of one or two weeks in a year, and some not coming back for years. The next is a family of six, living in the United States. One absent ten years, married and settled in Washbourne, Maine. Another absent ten years, married and settled in Lubeck. Another absent four years, married and settled in Boston, Massachusetts. Another absent three years, married, living in Acton, Massachusetts. Another absent seven years, married; settled in Ashmount, Massachusetts. Another absent four years, married and settled in Brockton, Massachusetts; of these, four are women and two men. The next is a family of four, of which the first is a woman, absent twenty-two years, resident of the United States. The next, absent seventeen years, a resident of the United States. The next, absent eleven years, residing in the United States, and the last, seven years, and resident in the United States. The next is a family of five. The first one, absent twelve years, married to an American citizen, living in Hyde Park, Massachusetts. The next living in Boston. The next in Boston. The next in Montana, and the next in Hyde Park, Massachusetts. The next is a family of eight. The first one of this family became a resident of the United States in 1878; another became a resident of the United States in 1884; another in 1883; another in 1880; another in 1883; another in 1885; another in 1889. The next family is composed of four, the eldest is a daughter, a woman married, and who has a family living in Stoneham, Massachusetts. The next has a family living in Carleton, N.B. Of course, she would go into the census, but not in that section, and the other two are living in New Brunswick. The next one, a gentleman named Lombard, living in Dorchester, Massachusetts, a doctor, practising four years, and a naturalized American citizen. I have had the pleasure of being at his house in Dorchester. He is an American citizen, and was in the States four years when the census was taken. The next is a family, two of which have been six years in Marino, California, and the third seven years in Boston, Mass. Another family of four, of which the first was absent thirteen years, a naturalized citizen, captain of an American vessel. The next, absent five years, a naturalized American citizen. The next, absent seven years, a herdsman, living in the western States, and the last, absent four years, is a mate with his brother, the first one to whom I alluded, who is a sea captain, and a naturalized American citizen. Another family of three, living respectively in Massachusetts, California and Boston, and the next, a family of two, absent five years, one in California, and one in Cambridgeport, Massachusetts."

NOTE.—The late Government, though utterly unable to refute or even deny Dr. Borden's statements, not only refused to take any steps to correct these frauds, but absolutely declined to assist or rather to permit Dr. Borden to make any further investigations, thereby making themselves, in the most marked manner, accomplices in these outrageous frauds after the fact, even if they did not originally instigate them. The exact extent cannot now be ascertained, but it is evident that if Dr. Borden's case be a fair sample of what was going on elsewhere the population of the Dominion was over-estimated in 1891 by very many thousands. This, of course, will diminish by so much the apparent increases whatever it may be in 1901.

The National Policy.

Voices—"What's the matter with the National Policy?"
 "What about free trade?"

Sir Richard—What's the matter with the National Policy? Well, I think the citizens of Toronto from the year 1890 to 1896 could tell pretty well what was the matter with the National Policy. (Laughter and cheers.) I don't think that during those six years the growth of Toronto was as much as its citizens would desire. I don't think that during those six years you had as much building as has gone on for the last six weeks in Toronto. (Hear, hear, and great cheering.) And now, sir, I desire to say a few words about the National Policy. Does the hon. gentleman want to know? The National Policy was an admirable device to enable Peter to rob Paul—(great laughter and cheering)—but it made no genuine increase to the general national wealth. Some localities and some individuals may have been benefitted by it, but the nation as a whole did not—(hear, hear)—and the best proof of that is this: that from 1881 to 1891, when it was in full swing, Canada never grew so slowly from the days that Canada was first settled till to-day. (Hear, hear and cheers.)

The National Debt.

Now, sir, I desire to say a little as to the question of the condition of the National debt, and here is a most remarkable fact, to which I call the attention of those enterprising journalists, that in all the diatribes which have been levelled at us for increasing the national debt, I have failed to find one single word, in Mail, in Gazette or in Star, alluding to the trifling fact that the late Government went out of office leaving liabilities to the extent of sixteen millions undischarged behind them. (Hear, hear.) Sir, when we took office the first thing we found was that in order to complete the canals which they had in progress we would require twelve millions of dollars at least, perhaps more. The next thing we found was that in order to pay the railway subsidies which they had left undischarged four millions further would be required, and that, bear in mind, takes no account whatever of the railway subsidies that they proposed to add in 1896, or of the expenditure for Prince Edward Island, which they also proposed to add, or, for that matter, of the Crow's Nest. Now, here let me say that I never heard any Liberal leader, and I certainly myself never pretended, that there was any

reason in a country like Canada for objecting to a reasonable expenditure, always provided that that expenditure was useful and fruitful. (Hear, hear.) What we object to—what we have a right to object to—was piling tens and tens of millions of debt upon the people and making them no return, (Hear, hear.) What we objected to, and what we had a right to object to, was that the whole future of the old provinces should be mortgaged, as they were mortgaged, for the benefit of the younger provinces, and that the lands from which we ought to have been recouped were practically thrown away.

Klondike Administration.

You want to know how the Liberal party have discharged their trust in that respect? (A voice—We do.) I invite you to compare their conduct in respect of the administration of the Klondike with the conduct of our predecessors with respect to the administration of the northwest. In each case great possibilities were open; in each case a vast heritage was put at the disposal of the people of Canada. We have taken the Yukon in hand; we have expended large sums in the Yukon; but up to date the Yukon has not cost the rest of the people of Canada one copper. (Hear, hear.) Up to date all that has been expended in the Yukon has been extracted from those carrying on mining operations in the Yukon, most of them, be it remembered, aliens and foreigners—(hear hear)—who were justly entitled to contribute to the revenue here. (Cheers.) Now, as I have said, we always contended that any expenditure should be made fruitful.

Crow's Nest Expenditure.

Let us take one case which has been much criticised, one case to which my friend Mr. Campbell has alluded—that is, our expenditure on the Crow's Nest Railway. For that we gave the Canadian Pacific Railway a matter of \$3,300,000 or thereabouts. We exacted from them divers concessions of great importance to the northwest, of great importance to the manufacturers and artisans of Canada. Now, sir, what has been done for the people of Canada? Very lately I had occasion to inquire of a gentleman very well conversant with that whole country what the result of expending that money in constructing the Crow's Nest Pass had been in the way of adding wealth and value of the properties thereby developed; and after

taking some considerable time to examine it, he gave it to me as his opinion, and as a very conservative estimate which he supported by very ample proof, that in all human probability the construction of the Crow's Nest Railway under the Government subsidy of \$3,300,000 had resulted in developing wealth to the extent of thirty or forty millions in the region which was then opened. (Cheers.) He went on to show—and this is of importance, ladies and gentlemen, to all of you—by constructing that railway we had developed industries from which at this present moment something like three or four millions are being expended in wages and in the purchase of necessaries for enterprises which could by no possibility have been developed unless this Crow's Nest Railway had been constructed; and I have in my hand here very ample evidence that so far as the revenues of Canada are concerned we at least have been no losers, but, on the contrary, very great gainers, by the amount which we sunk in that railway.

A Paying Investment.

Our capital charge on this \$3,300,000 amounts roughly to some \$80,000 or \$90,000. Sir, the return that we get in added customs duties, and in added excise duties is, in all human probability, a matter of \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year from that source alone—(cheers)—and probably in three or four years, or five at the utmost, the added receipts to your customs and excise arising from the construction of that same railway will amply recoup you for every farthing that has been spent. Now, I call that good political economy. (Hear, hear.) I call that a wise expenditure. I say that if I am able to spend \$90,000 and put \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year into the treasury I do a good thing for the people of Canada. (Cheers.) I only wish it were possible for us to invest, not three millions, but thirty millions of your money equally profitably, and if I could I would do it to-morrow. (Hearty cheers.) Why, sir, within three years the revenues of British Columbia, for customs alone, have risen from about a million to two and a-quarter millions, and, although a large share of that is undoubtedly due to the development of the Klondike, a very large share of it, as our customs returns sufficiently show, is due to the expansion of Rossland and the Kootenay country and the rest of the regions that have been opened up by the Crow's Nest Pass. Why, sir, to-day the excise revenue in Rossland and Nelson alone would more than pay the interest on the capital that has been expended by us in constructing

the Crow's Nest Pass; and I only trust that the expenditure which you are now about to undertake for the purpose of opening up New Ontario and developing the Rainy River will prove half as useful and half as good. (Cheers.)

Prudence and Economy.

Gentlemen, remember this, I do not for one moment desire or pretend that all this is any excuse for extravagance or waste. On the contrary, the greater the revenue the greater the occasion for prudence and wise economy in laying it out; but I do contend that it is a justification for liberal expenditure for worthy objects. Sir, if there were any one of you who found his income within three years suddenly doubled, I think that that man would and should, and that you would admit that he was perfectly justified in indulging in some expenditures which would have been absurd for him to have undertaken before. If a merchant's capital were suddenly doubled he would be justified in undertaking ventures which would have been foolish in the extreme for him to have undertaken before. Now, sir, in this connection of capital expenditure, I desire to call your attention to one or two somewhat significant facts, showing how far the accusation is justified that the present Government has been reckless in adding to the capital charges of this country. I have here our capital expenditure for the years 1894 to 1899. In 1894 I find that the late Government expended four and a half millions on capital account. They added that to the net capital debt. I find that in 1895 they added \$5,891,000 to our capital debt. In 1896 they added \$5,422,000 to our capital debt; and I find that in 1897, under this Administration, we added in all \$3,041,000 to the net capital debt; in 1898 we added to our national debt \$2,417,000, of which \$930,000 was simply the discount of a 2½ per cent loan which Mr. Fielding negotiated in that year. I find that in 1899, the year which is now closed, our total expenditure has been larger than usual, but the total addition to our national debt will amount to one million of dollars, and no more. (Cheers.) Now, gentlemen, if you will deduct the discount of the loan, which is in no respect the increase of our capital debt, seeing that we obtained the loan at an extremely low rate, you will find that in three years—1897, 1898 and 1899—the total addition we have made to our capital debt amounts to \$5,528,000, being as nearly as possible one-third of the amount which was added to the net capital debt in 1894, 1895 and 1896. (Cheers.)

Canada's Enormous Wealth.

And here you may very fairly ask, if you see fit, Granted that this country has increased enormously in the volume of its imports and exports; granted that it has increased for the time being the annual income of its citizens, what fair ground is there for believing that these increases will be permanent? And here, gentlemen, I admit that, we must, to a certain extent, depend on estimate and calculation; but, for my part, I believe that we have barely scratched the enormous mineral deposits which Canada possesses. I think there is every reason to believe that within the course of the next few years the gross mineral products of Canada, of all sorts, from her coal mines, iron mines, nickel mines, gold and silver mines, will likely equal something like one hundred millions of dollars, and I need not point out to you what an enormous source of wealth, not merely for the miner, not merely for the capitalist who invests his property in mines, but for the Canadian manufacturer, for the Canadian artisan, for the Canadian grower of produce which these miners must consume, will be found in the extension and new addition to the wealth of the country, even if it amount to but one-half of the amount which I believe is fairly estimated and fairly calculated for.

Canada's Trade Beats American.

Then we have another and very great source of wealth which up to the present moment we have hardly touched at all. I allude to the extraordinary amount of water-power which we possess along the St. Lawrence and its tributaries. Up to the present time we have depended almost exclusively on coal as a motive power; but there appears to be very good reason for believing that the huge water-power which Canada possesses will shortly become a source of profit and wealth to its citizens and manufacturers equal to, and possibly greater, than the wealth which we expect to extract from our mineral resources; and, gentlemen, it may interest you perhaps to make a little comparison for one moment between the volume of trade of Canada and the volume of trade in the United States. Sir, it is not a matter which any Canadian, I think, need be ashamed of. I have received within the last few days the details of the total volume of trade of the United States for the year 1899. They amount to \$1,224,000,000 of exports, and \$697,000,000 of imports,

on which, be it remembered, a duty of \$206,000,000 was collected. Canada for the same year has a total trade of \$319,500,000; so that Canada with a population of about 5,300,000 in 1899, as against the United States, with a population of 73,500,000 by estimation in the same period, has a total trade of \$57.73 per head, as against a total trade for the United States of \$26.16—(loud cheers)—the total volume of our trade being thus somewhat more than double the total volume of trade in the United States. (Applause.) In the matter of exports Canada exports \$25 worth of goods for every man, woman and child in the country, as against \$16.70 per head in the United States. (Renewed applause.) In this connection I may observe that it is worth while noticing that the dutiable goods imported into the United States in 1898 amounted to \$396,844,966, and the percentage of duty levied on those goods was 52. The percentage of goods imported into Canada amounts to a little over 28 per cent., very little more than one-half of the percentage imposed in the United States. That bears on a question which has been brought forward, not infrequently, namely, the allegation that the present tariff is a highly protective tariff. There is an easy method of distinguishing between a high revenue and a high protective tariff. Ours is a high revenue tariff, it is true. But there never was a protective tariff under which the imports increased as fast as those of Canada have done in a single year. Look at the American tariff and you will find that after the passage of the Dingley bill American imports fell from \$750,000,000 to under \$700,000,000. Remember this, too, that in imposing the tariff it is quite possible for you, under a high revenue tariff, to impose a higher duty on American goods without prohibiting importation that you can impose on British goods. (Applause.) American imports will bear as a revenue tax a higher tariff than British goods will bear, for reasons apparent to all, and if there was no other good reason, and none other is wanted, for the preference which we have extended to the mother country, that should be sufficient. (Loud applause.) I may add that it is a great mistake to suppose that the reduction of taxes which has taken place in our preferential tariff is confined to the goods imported from England. Bear this in mind, that you compel the American manufacturer to reduce his prices to you in proportion. It may be true, and it is true, that the volume of our trade with the United States has not greatly diminished, but the volume of American profits has greatly diminished, and in such case the Canadian consumer very largely benefits. (Applause.)

Pertinent Questions.

Now, I desire to address a question or two to our opponents in this hall or elsewhere. I would like to know why they have considered our proceedings so monstrous, why they have considered we have been so extravagant, so careless, so indifferent as to increasing the public debt, when they have carefully concealed from the people the liabilities of over \$16,000,000 which they had incurred, over \$20,000,000 in fact if I were to add the additional sums they proposed to expend? (Applause.) Why have they chosen to conceal from the people of Canada the fact that for every dollar of the great bulk of the additions we have made to the expenditure from year to year we have received an equal amount in cash and put it in the treasury, including the amount we have spent on the Intercolonial Railway? Why have they chosen to conceal from you that a large proportion of our increased expenditure consists simply of sums expended in the Yukon for the preserving of law and good order, every penny of which comes out of the pockets of the people there and does not add to your burdens? (Applause.) Why have they concealed the fact that the fixed charges now paid by the people of Canada are scarcely more than \$65,000 over the sum demanded by Mr. Foster in 1897? Why have they seen fit to conceal the fact that he asked for almost the same sum for 1897 as Mr. Fielding asks for 1900? Why are they so terror-stricken at the idea of our adding \$6,000,000 of indebtedness to the capital amount of our debt, and under \$70,000 a year to our fixed charges, and why they had not a word to say against the Government that preceded us in a like space of time adding \$16,000,000 to our debt? (Applause.) I make no claim that the present Government is a perfect one; that it has not committed its errors and mistakes as all Governments have done. There is much still to be done, but I take the position broadly and say that for every new expenditure we have made you have received an ample return. (Renewed applause.) Where we have added one million to the public debt, ten millions have been added to the wealth of the people. Where we have added one hundred thousand dollars to the annual fixed charges, we have added five or six hundred thousand dollars to the annual income of the people of Canada. (Long continued applause.) The general development of the country is greater than it has ever been up to the present time. There has been no rash outlay committed, and in all human probability when the 1st of July, 1900, is reached the debt per head of the population of Canada will be very considerably

less than in 1896 or 1897. Supposing we had adopted the other course. Suppose, for instance, we had allowed the Yukon to remain without proper government. Disorder would have reigned. Dawson would be like Skaguay, the nest for every cut-throat and scoundrel in the Yukon. But the way in which the Yukon Territory, on the whole, has been administered, is infinitely to the credit of Canada and the present Administration. (Loud applause.) I say, and I believe, that there is no intelligent American who would not substantiate my assertion, that since we took possession of the Yukon and established our government at Dawson there has been less crime, robbery and murder at Dawson, with its population of 30,000 to 40,000, in one year than in Skaguay in a week.

The Government's Enterprise.

Sir, we might have taken no steps to promote immigration. We might have taken no steps to develop British Columbia. We might have taken no steps to extend the Intercolonial Railway—we might have left its terminus in a ploughed field as we found it. We might have given you no penny post. We might have taken ten years to finish your canals instead of completing them in three. We might have done all those things, and possibly we might have saved apparently a few hundred thousand dollars on your annual expenditure. But had we done so your annual income would have been many millions less than it is to-day. Had we done so, the wealth of the people of Canada would have been less by tens and tens of millions than it is to-day. Had we done so, the population of Canada would have been less by several hundred of thousands than it is to-day. Sir, to my mind the best test of prosperity in any country, and more particularly in a country like Canada, lies in this fact—is it a country where the people remain and seek their fortunes in it? Is it a country to which strangers from other lands come to seek their fortunes, or is it a country from which the natives fly? Is it a country in which when you bring the people to it you find it impossible to retain them? What was the position of Canada in the years from 1881 to 1891?

A voice—What about the bye-elections?

Another voice—What about the Senate?

Sir Richard Cartwright—You may leave the Senate to Providence—(loud cheers)—which in its own good time will doubtless take that millstone from off the necks of the people. (Loud cheers)

and laughter.) Now, sir, as I have said, I cannot but think that those among you who choose to study these questions intelligently and carefully, those among you who will remember that within the last three years, as I have said, Canada has advanced by leaps and bounds in a manner such as very few other countries have known—that our population has increased, that our volume of trade has increased, that our exports have increased, that our wealth has increased, that our mineral resources have increased enormously, that everything promises a reasonable continuance of prosperity if we are only true to ourselves—will, I think, admit that I am fully justified in saying to you that there is no cause for alarm because, by reason of the cross entries that I have alluded to, your annual expenditure appears to have been increased by two or three million dollars.

How Trade has Grown.

And now here let me call your attention to one or two important facts. Sir, I said just now that I would show you that it was no mere rhetorical flourish but a simple fact when I stated to you that between 1896 and 1899 the trade of Canada had increased as much in a period of three years as it had done before in thirty years. Sir, I go back to the first year of Canadian Confederation, when we had no Prince Edward Island, when we had no British Columbia, when we had no Northwest Territories, and when we had no Manitoba, and I find that in 1868 our total volume of trade was just \$131,000,000. In 1895 our total volume of trade had increased to \$224,000,000, being an increase in that long interval of something like \$92,000,000. Since 1895 down to 1899 our total volume of trade has increased from \$224,000,000 to \$319,500,000, being an increase of \$95,000,000 in those three or four years, as compared with an increase of \$92,000,000 from 1868 to 1895. (Loud cheers.) I call your attention also to the fact that the gross income of Canada has increased from \$34,000,000 in 1895 to \$46,000,000 and better in 1899. I call your attention to the fact that the income of Canada has increased in all human probability—I mean the income of the people collectively—by over \$50,000,000 in that interval; and, what is perhaps more important than all, that whereas our population was very nearly at a standstill it has increased something more than 100 per cent. faster within the last three years than it had done in the preceding period.

A voice—How much did the debt increase in that time?

Sir Richard Cartwright—I am going to give my friend a statement which I see his political preceptors have forgotten to tell him. (Laughter.) We inherited obligations amounting to \$15,000,000 or \$16,000,900 from our predecessors, and they were willing to have added six or seven millions more. By 1899 we had discharged those fifteen millions, and we have only added six millions to the net capital debt of Canada. (Loud cheers.) Where we have made any important new expenditure, as in the case of the Crow's Nest Railway, it has been, as I have pointed out to you, of a thoroughly fruitful character. More than that, by the reduction which we have effected in the rate of interest, by which in all probability we will be able to fund our debt at a rate of between $2\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 per cent., we have made a provision which within the next few years, during which time about \$150,000,000 of our debt will mature, will enable us to refund an indebtedness on which we are now paying for interest and sinking fund at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum at something between $2\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 per cent., thereby saving between two and three millions to the public exchequer. (Cheers.)

A voice—What is the debt of the country ?

Sir Richard Cartwright—I will give my friend the figures if he will allow me to collect the memoranda I have here. The net debt of the country was \$265,000,000 on the 1st of July, as nearly as it is possible to estimate. It is a large debt, and, as I have had occasion to say before on the floor of Parliament, and I do not hesitate to repeat it here, if the people of Canada in 1878 had chosen to renew their confidence in honest and sagacious Alexander Mackenzie in all human probability everything we have done since would have been done and done better, and the debt would have been well under \$200,000,000.

The Alien Labor Law.

A Voice—Sir Richard, why does not Sir Wilfrid Laurier enforce the Alien Labor Act ?

Sir Richard Cartwright—Because, inasmuch as our predecessors contrived to send a million of Canadians into exile in the United States, and because at the present moment a very great number of our people at various points on the frontier are being employed in the United States, we do not desire, on account of the acts of one single United States official in a neighboring city, and because two or three injudicious men choose to abuse the little brief

authority they have got, to deprive a great many Canadians of valuable employment. (Loud cheers.)

A Voice (interrupting)—Why did you put the law on the Statute Book ?

Sir Richard Cartwright—But if we find our leniency is abused and that advantage is being taken to introduce foreign laborers here to the injury of Canadian artisans, then we will assuredly enforce the Alien Labor Act against anybody and everybody. (Cheers.)

Now, sir, I have pointed out to you that the apparent increase of expenditure has been almost entirely due to cross entries, that is to say, to expenditures for which we received a full equivalent and which in no respect add to the burdens of the people of Canada. And while I am on that point I might say one word about one particular item in our estimates which has been made the subject of very severe criticism—that is, the large sum which my friend, Mr. Tarte, found himself obliged to demand for the public service in the matter of public works.

Expenditure on Public Works.

Now, I want to call your attention to the fact that there are in Canada at this moment an immense number of public works—probably 500 or 600 of various sorts; that many of these are exposed to constant dilapidation, and that they require to be carefully preserved and protected, unless we choose to incur at a very short date a large expenditure for the purpose of restoring them. More than that, Mr. Tarte, when he came into office, besides finding that a great many public works had been allowed to get into a condition which called for urgent measures of repair. Mr. Tarte found, as I can testify also, that in a very considerable number of counties from one end of the Dominion to the other which had the misfortune to return Liberals during the period from 1878 to 1896, no works at all had been carried out, no matter how urgent the wants of the locality might have been, and that to a very great extent the public works that had been previously constructed in them had been allowed to go to rack and ruin. Mr. Tarte did as Mr. Mackenzie had found himself compelled to do under somewhat similar circumstances—he determined to remedy the injustice that had been committed; he determined to repair the works which had been allowed to go into disuse, and he demanded for that reason a rather unusu-

ally large sum, it is true; but let me recall to the minds of my elder auditors the fact that under similar conditions with far fewer public works to maintain, while Mr. Tarte demanded a little more than \$3,000,000, Mr. Mackenzie found himself compelled in 1876 to ask for \$2,791,000—a sum in proportion to the number of public works under his control at that time quite as large as the sum which Mr. Tarte has demanded.

Future Expenses Lighter.

There is no reason whatever for expecting that after these works have been put in proper repair and justice has been done to these localities who were punished by the late Government for their fidelity to Liberal principles, there is no reason whatever to suppose that any unusual or abnormal expenditure will be required for public works; and, in any case, as I have said, it is fair to conclude that while we have a full treasury there is good and fair ground for making a reasonable expenditure for reasonable public purposes. If they can show that this expenditure is extravagant or misplaced, then, gentlemen, they will have very good ground for attacking the present Government; but it is noteworthy to observe that while they charge Mr. Tarte with all manner of extravagance they only backed their opinion in the late Parliament to the extent of about \$32,000 for that was all that they voted to reduce his estimate by. (Cheers.) More than that, I have told you our future obligations by the end of the year 1900 are at present entirely insignificant.

Costly Senate Obstructions.

It is true that the conduct of the Senate, of which I do not desire at present to speak too harshly—the unfortunate conduct of the Senate in refusing to allow us to construct a railway communication between Glenora and Teslin did most undoubtedly gravely embarrass the Government in their recent negotiations with the United States, and will in its long result probably entail upon us a very considerable expenditure for the purpose of opening communication through our own territory with our own country. But, bar that, I know at this present moment of no large expenditure which need be incurred by us, unless very clear and good ground is shown for believing that it is in the public interest to do so.

A Business Administration.

And now, sir, what else have we done? Well, sir, we have done this: over and above what we have done in the way of developing this country, what we have done in the way of promoting trade, what we have done in the way of reducing taxation, we have settled and successfully settled, one of those dangerous and burning questions dividing religious denominations of one kind from religious denominations of another, dividing race from race, setting Province against Province—we have settled that, and settled it so successfully that I do not believe to-day in Manitoba that either party takes the slightest notice of the former discussion and dispute over the separate schools in that region. (Applause.) Then, sir, we have done another thing, which, I think, all true Canadians will agree with me is one that this Government has a right to be proud of, which the people of Canada have a right to be proud of. We have shown, sir, that we at any rate believed in the unity of the empire, and we have done more in the way of developing a wholesome Imperial sentiment between Great Britain and her colonies than has been done by all the talk, all the bluster, all the jingoism, with which this place and others have resounded for the last twenty years. (Here, here, and great cheering.) When we give a specific preference to English manufacturers, then sir, we showed that the Liberals were prepared to do what Conservatives had only been prepared to talk about. (Here, hear, and laughter and cheers.) We showed, sir, that we at any rate were prepared to recognize and to deal fairly with the country which dealt fairly with us; and we have not heard the last word about that yet, because I believe that the example we have set is likely to be followed by every English race, by every English colony, by every English dependency from one end of the inhabited globe to the other. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) And, sir, while these men ask us "Why didn't you drive a huckstering bargain with England? Why didn't you attempt to get a preference in English markets? Why didn't you get them to impose duties on the products of other races?" I reply to that, sir, that to all intents and purposes Canada and Canadian manufacturers and Canadian products have to-day a real preference in the English market. I tell you that if Canadians choose to make a wise use of the advantages which we have procured for them, if Canadians will send to England goods as they ought to send, worthy of Canada, goods such as we are able to send, goods which will command and

retain the preference they now have in the English market, they may make their own terms and command their own prices without the need of any treaty or any agreement whatever. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

Canada in the Lead.

More than that, sir; for the first time in her history, Canada has asserted herself. Canada has become to all intents and purposes a real factor in the British Empire. (Hear, hear.) When before was it heard that in conducting negotiations with the United States, England permitted four Canadian plenipotentiaries to be associated with one representative of England? (Hear, hear.) And here let me say—and it is only justice to Sir Charles Tupper to say that he has frankly admitted the fact—that I think the result of those negotiations have proved to you that although we do desire, as we had a right to desire, to establish the most friendly relations with the great republic beside us; yet, in the hands of the Liberal Government and of the Liberal party you need never be afraid that Canadian interests will be sacrificed or that Canadian honor will be allowed to be set on one side in any negotiations with any power in the world. (Great applause.) Sir, it may be that we have builded better than we knew. I believe for my part that the example which we have set is going to have, and that at no distant day, very great and important results. I, for my part, hold with Mr. Kipling, that when we took the step we did we set an example which will ring from one end of the world to the other:—

“ We have proved our faith in the heritage
 By more than the word of the mouth,
 Those that are wise may follow
 When the world's war-trumpet blows,
 But we, we are first in the battle,
 Said Our Lady of the Snows.”

(Loud and prolonged cheering, the audience rising and waving handkerchiefs.)

Additional copies of this pamphlet may be had from
 ALEXANDER SMITH, 34 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario.

In ordering it will be sufficient to refer to pamphlet as No. 1.

