

just this one comparison. The surplus which is boasted and which it is proposed to maintain, is a surplus, which, if you applied it to English finances, would be equivalent to at least a surplus of at least \$80,000,000. If you applied to the finances of the Mother Country the scheme you apply to our finances, you would suppose a Finance Minister bringing down a Budget which would produce a surplus of \$80,000,000. There has been—and no man more heartily rejoices in it than the humble individual who now addresses you—a period of three or four years in which there has been prosperity. We have had excellent crops, good prices, a revival of the lumber trade, and very great development in other ways. The hon. member for Pictou gratified us by the information that the fisheries had been very productive and the prices high, and so in almost every direction has been shown the evidence of a period of prosperity. But I believe that we would be acting an imprudent part if we were to so conduct the affairs of this country, if we were so to shape them during the Session as if our progress were, in these regards, assured at the same rate for the future. I believe that we have already reached the period of over-speculation, of over-trade, of over-importation. I believe that we have already experienced a very considerable amount of stringency arising from these causes, and from the further cause that the very large sum levied by the grant from the people, and devoted as it has been devoted, and the absence of the foreign borrowings which formerly tended to mitigate the adverse balances of trade, have pressed more than in former years upon the domestic resources of the country. I believe that those very exertions to which the hon. gentleman has referred, these very leaps and bounds by which we have been progressing, are exertions which bring with them, unless we are cautious and take heed in him, seeds of difficulty, aye, even of disaster. While I do not believe that irremediable mischief has yet been done, I do think it is extremely important that the hon. Minister, who is specially charged with the question of finances, should not, upon this occasion, repeat the advice which, as reported, he gave a couple of years ago to the public when he said that he was now comparatively advanced in years, but if he were a young man he would do what he advised all young men to do in trade: clap on full sail for a period of ten years of assured prosperity. I believe that by such advice as this the hon. gentleman is paving the way, not to a period of permanent prosperity, but a period of difficulty. If we look to our own past experience, to the past experience of the United States, of the United Kingdom, and all other commercial countries, we shall find that they do not verify the observation of the hon. gentleman; and that caution and care, rather than sanguine expectation—with all the favoring conditions which existed for the last three or four years—ought to be the watch-word which he, as the financial custodian of the country, ought to give to us for our guidance at this time. The announcement is made by the Administration that also is gloried in by their supporters, that the public expenditure on capital account, which is expenditure on account of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been paid for out of the taxes. Once again we have a strange contrast between promises and performance, between professions and results. I remember very well, when hon. gentlemen opposite asserted time and again that they did not intend to pay for the Canadian Pacific Railway out of increased public taxes. I remember when they passed formal resolutions to that effect. I remember when they declared that the arrangements would be such that taxes would not need to be increased. They now ask us to express our gratitude that we are paying for the railway out of the surplus taxes. I remember at a more recent period, when the hon. Minister proclaimed that it was the policy and ambition of the Government to reduce importations and redress the adverse

balance of trade. I remember when they congratulated the country upon the reduced importations, the large extent of which, he said, had caused a great portion of our past difficulties, and upon what he thought was the improved balance of trade from time to time, until at last the acme of his delight was reached, when in one Budget Speech he was able to announce the balance of trade was on the right side, the exports exceeding the imports by a small sum; now we are asked to rejoice with him to-day—versatile man that he is—because our imports so largely exceed the exports. A list of the increased imports to which our increased receipts are due, was given by the hon. gentleman who seconded the resolutions, from which it appears there has been, even over the imports of last year, large as they were, in a great many staples of the country, a very large increased import. I was very glad to read that paragraph in the Speech which gave assurance of an increased immigration, and still more pleased to learn the statistical information which the hon. member for Pictou gave on the subject of the immigration of last year. I have not myself been able, of course, not having at my command the sources of information which the hon. gentleman had, to reach conclusions on that subject. I have only such as the newspapers have from time to time given us. They did not lead me to the conclusion that the number was so great, and I am rather inclined to think that the 113,000 must include the Chinese who came into British Columbia. Where is the late member for Vancouver? Where is the late member for Victoria? Why, I remember when the news was flashed across the wires last Session of the influx of Chinese into British Columbia, in what diplomatic language the hon. First Minister pointed out the difference between the Mongolian and Caucasian races, and said that although the time might come when it would be desirable to restrict Chinese immigration, such immigration was highly desirable while the railway was being built. Chinese immigration was not the permanent valuable immigration as that of European. When we are asked to-day to congratulate ourselves on this increase of 113,000, I ask are the Chinese included in it. Judging from the expression of the countenance of the hon. member for Pictou, I conclude that they are. I wonder what the real permanent valuable immigration has been. I do not know, I am sure. I am told in Ontario it was 34,000, an increase that is considerable and gratifying in itself, but if the estimates made in the newspapers a little while ago of the immigration into Manitoba and the North-West were correct the great proportion was from the other Provinces. It is extremely important to the Dominion as a whole, and the Province of Ontario in particular, that we should encourage immigration from abroad. Up to last year it has been almost entirely from the older Provinces; and even last year as far as public information leads us to conclude, it has been to a very large extent an emigration from the older Provinces, particularly from Ontario. I am not sorry for that. I am very glad that any large number of men, intelligent and enterprising, from the older Provinces should go out there and develop that country. I think it is ominous of good to that country that those who are by birth, by education, and by association, deeply attached to the older Provinces, should take the most prominent and first places in the settlement of the newer country, and their acquaintance with our modes of thought and action, with our modes of government, with our municipal institutions, as developed in the various Provinces, and with our school system, will be valuable to an extent not to be estimated in moulding upon what we believe to be the best and most progressive principles the institutions of the newer land of which they are the pioneers. But while I say so unreservedly as that that I do not merely consent to, but most heartily approve of and congratulate the country upon the fact that there has been a predominance up to