

expenditure had swollen double—from \$13,500,000 to \$26,600,000. Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to say to that? The expenditure had swollen from \$13,500,000 to \$23,500,000 at the time the hon. gentleman came into power, according to his own statement on Friday night. Yet, what was his first step? Did he say that was enough for him? Big as it was swollen it was too small for him. Big as it was swollen his first step was to come down and ask the House for \$3,000,000 more in order to carry on the ordinary government of the country. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman would act wisely if he said little about it. He declared in England that the increased expenditure was of such a character that it had greatly advanced the best interests of the Dominion, yet the hon. gentleman now declared that such increase was unnecessary; because if it does not mean that it means nothing, for if the increase was necessary for public purposes, then the Minister of Finance would not be warranted, if he failed to bring down such estimates to Parliament; if, on the other hand, they were beyond what they should have been, then the Finance Minister should defend himself for coming to Parliament in 1874 and asking for \$26,600,000. The hon. gentleman's first estimate was only \$400,000 less than the statement now on the Table of the House; yet he charges us with extravagance. I now desire to direct the attention of the House to a very important statement made by the hon. member on Friday night. He said:

"Immediately on the introduction of that policy, as every one acquainted with western Canada knows, there was a large and lamentable exodus of many of the best farmers of the western region, not, I am sorry to say, to our own North-West, but to Dakota, Minnesota, and other portions of the United States."

Who is to blame for that? The hon. gentleman bows his head: he is. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is quite conscious who is to blame.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. You are to blame.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will show the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it. I will direct attention, while on this point, to another remark made by the hon. gentleman, as it relates to the same subject. He said:

"If ever an impudent assertion was made on the floor of this House, if ever there was a case of effrontery in this world, it was when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and dared to say that the Opposition were responsible for the fact that so many Canadians had gone to Minnesota and Dakota, in place of going to the Canadian North-West."

I am in the judgment of the House as to whether hon. gentlemen opposite for years have not been decrying and denouncing everything Canadian.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am in the judgment of the House, of both sides of it, as to whether those hon. gentlemen have not, both in their places in Parliament and on the public platform, done all that men could do to cause men to turn their backs on Canada and take up their residence in the United States. I will read a statement made by the ex-Finance Minister, and if he can find any advertisement published in the United States more calculated to draw people from Canada to that country, where the hon. gentleman is not known but only has the reputation of having been a Finance Minister, then I should like to see it. What did the hon. gentleman say here in his place in Parliament on Friday night? He ventured to use such language as this with respect to his country:

"Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or to sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or other."

Is that calculated to draw immigrants to Canada. That is the language that he and his friends have used in expressing their opinions of this country. I say there is no intelligent man who places confidence in, or believes in the statements of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hon. gentlemen opposite, who would not turn his back at the first opportunity on this country and remove to any other country in the world. That is the position which the hon. gentleman occupies, and that is the kind of work that he and those around him have been engaged in doing for years in the interest of Canada. Despite all their efforts, they have worked in vain. Under the financial policy of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, enacted into law by Parliament, all the efforts of the hon. gentlemen opposite have proved to be futile, and to have only recoiled on themselves, and they will only have the result of teaching an intelligent people, keenly alive to their own interests, who are the men in this country upon whose statements they may place reliance, and who are the men upon whose management of public affairs they may wisely depend. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman entertained us with his novel theory respecting the balance of trade. We have been accustomed to hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about the United States and the statesmen of that great country, who have proved themselves to be about as successful in the management of financial affairs as those of any country in the world. I know of no instance in which the financial management of the Government has been crowned with such remarkable results as in the United States. What did President Grant say on the question of balance of trade? Did he say that the more the balance of trade was against the United States the better? President Grant, in his Message of the 6th of December, 1876, said:

"Taxes have been reduced, within the last seven years, nearly three hundred millions of dollars, and the National Debt has been reduced, in the same time, over four hundred and thirty-five millions of dollars. By refunding the six per cent. bonded debt for bonds bearing 5 and 4½ per cent. interest, respectively, the annual interest has been reduced from over one hundred and thirty millions of dollars, in 1869, to but little over one hundred millions of dollars in 1876."

President Grant then adds the boast that the balance of trade has been changed from \$130,000,000 against the United States in 1869, to \$120,000,000 in their favor in 1876. The hon. gentleman says that it is perfectly obvious, if you send \$60,000 or \$70,000 away and receive back \$90,000, you make money by the exchange. He forgets that the balance has to be paid in certain cases. I need not say, with respect to England, that no comparison can be drawn, because it is the great money centre of the world, and occupies an entirely different position from countries generally. The hon. gentleman says we have increased the cost of living, and gives the reason "that on every yard of coarse tweed the poor man uses, the Tariff compels him to pay 25 or 30 or 40 per cent. and perhaps more, than in 1878." Well, did the hon. gentleman not notice the statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister with respect to the wool trade of this country; did he fail to perceive that the amount of wool imported was reduced and a less quantity exported, while, at the same time, a greater quantity was used in this country, and the consumption of wool was increased by nearly \$3,000,000 during the year? What does that mean? Why, it means that the wise policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance gives such encouragement to the manufacture of these coarser cloths which the poor men require, that the amount of wool consumed in their manufacture is 3,000,000 lbs. over and above that of any previous year. That ought to be an explanation to the hon. gentleman, that it is quite possible for a tariff to be so constructed, in relation to the industries of a country, as to foster the manufacture of these articles within the country, so as, by competition, to furnish the people with them, as my hon. friend showed they had been furnished, at a lower cost, while giving profitable employment to our operators and consuming the wool grown in the country. The hon. gentleman is very anxious about the lumberman; he wants to know why we do not give the lumberman a bounty. I have passed over a great deal of what the hon. gentleman