

part of the old world. We will open our arms to them all, and bid them welcome, and make the Dominion of Canada, as I said in my closing remarks in a former speech, what Providence has designed it to be, one of the greatest, richest countries in the world, one we may be proud to belong to, especially by every man who has advocated and supported the policy that has in three years raised us to our present enviable position, a policy that will not be repealed, a policy that will be sustained either by gentlemen opposite, or by those on this side, for the will of the people will demand its permanency. Under these circumstances, we feel a pride and a satisfaction in meeting Parliament and presenting our case, and we are prepared to vindicate our position here and elsewhere, and we know that, at the close of this Session, when the arguments on both sides have been heard, and we have met our opponents face to face—as we are now stronger in the country than we were in 1878—we will be still stronger at the close of the Session than we are now, and that when the time comes to ask the people for the endorsement of our policy they will sustain us and send us back here to perfect and continue the policy we have inaugurated.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker: It is my pleasing duty, on the present occasion, to compliment the hon. the Minister of Finance on one important improvement on his previous practice. Until now, Sir, we have not, although he cannot say we have not urged and spurred him on, we have never been able to induce that hon. gentleman to bring down his Budget to Parliament in a reasonable time after the opening of the Legislature, and much valuable time has thereby been lost, wasted, I may say, to very little purpose. Now, Sir, although the hon. gentleman has been very slow, and very long in following the good example set under the Administration of my hon. friend, still even in this the eleventh, or it may be the twelfth, hour of this Parliament, we rejoice to hail ever so slight an improvement in this matter. I only wish I could push my congratulations further, and that the same improvement, which has been manifested in the expedition with which he has brought down his estimates, had been displayed in their preparation. I would that, besides copying us in the speed with which they were produced, he had also copied us in the economy with which they were framed; I would that he had produced a policy that might, in some small degree, justify the vaunts with which he has just concluded his exposition of that policy. It is not always particularly easy to follow that hon. gentleman. What between the subtlety of the hon. gentleman's logic and the complexity of the hon. gentleman's grammar, what between the curious convolutions of his arguments and the curious convolutions of his sentences now and then, if I should make a mistake and sometimes not clearly understand what he means, I must say I am not entirely to blame, and although he may not have any very great consideration for us on this side of the House—we do not expect it, and do not generally receive it—he ought, I think, to have some little consideration for those willing and faithful followers who are so ready to accept every statement that hon. gentleman may be pleased to make, either this year, or the year before, or the year before that. The hon. gentleman has given us, to-night, a new series of kaleidoscopic views of the beauties of the National Policy. If any of his followers happen to be afflicted with a sense of logic or good memories, they must be somewhat puzzled to reconcile the position occupied by that hon. gentleman to-night, with the position which that hon. gentleman has taken on many previous occasions. Sir, I think it would be well that the hon. gentleman should decide finally, what his followers are to believe on some of these important questions. Are we to understand, as we understood from that hon. gentleman not very long time ago, that it is a great misfortune for the

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

people of this country if the balance of trade be against them; or are we to understand that it is a good thing, if the balance of trade be in their favor under certain circumstances; or are we to understand, as I rather think he would have us understand, that it is a good thing to have the balance of trade in our favor if we happen to have a deficit, but a very bad thing indeed to have it in our favor, when having it in our favor would prevent us having a surplus. Now, on the present occasion, the hon. gentleman, although on other occasions he was very loud in discussing this matter of the balance of trade, has said nothing about the important fact that the balance of trade is very seriously against the Dominion of Canada for the past year. He was pleased to tell us that he had an excess of several millions of dollars over the sum he expected to raise, but he left it somewhat dubious whether an excess of several millions of dollars is to be held as a proof of the wonderful accuracy of his estimates, or as a proof that he succeeded in his leap in the dark. He has left it a mystery to us whether the real virtue, the real blessing the National Policy has bestowed upon us, is, as he told us three years ago, to reduce imports in every way, or whether the real end and purpose of his National Policy is to stimulate imports and thereby create a surplus? Are we to understand, after perusing these figures, after looking through our Public Accounts, that the hon. gentleman holds it to be the best proof possible of prudent statesmanship, that he has succeeded in doubling the taxes, and in doubling the expenditure of the people of Canada within some thirteen years? Are we to understand the hon. gentleman still continues of the mind that it is desirable for us to take it out of the Americans, as he put it a few years ago; and are we to look upon this remarkable increase which the last year's Trade Returns show of the imports from the United States, as a proof of the success of this policy of taking it out of the Americans? He tells us that everything, or almost everything, is cheaper now, that we have more taxes imposed upon almost everything. Is he prepared to follow that to the logical result and put on more taxes, so that we may ultimately get these things for nothing. The hon. gentleman was loud in explaining to the House that a certain number of thousands of hands, as to which I will say something presently, have been added to our population by his policy; but the hon. gentleman said nothing, for reasons which will presently appear, about the exodus which his friends at any rate choose to assert took place under the Administration of my hon. friend, or perhaps he has got new light upon that subject? Has he discovered that this prodigious exodus has resulted, according to the Census, in the remarkable circumstance that the great Province of Quebec, by the Census, grew twice as fast, while my hon. friend presided over the destinies of the country, as in the decade before? The hon. gentleman alluded most gingerly to the fact that a very short while ago, a very few years ago, he, an old Minister of Finance, had formally and solemnly stated his conviction that \$22,500,000 were ample to carry on the affairs of the Government of Canada. That was his statement before the last election. Now I find, in the year just closed, he spent \$25,500,000, or \$26,000,000 if we include the sum spent on Dominion lands. I find he asks for about \$27,000,000 for the service for the present year, and we all heard him tell us he expected to require \$27,750,000, without including Supplementary Estimates and without counting \$450,000 for Dominion Lands, for the year 1882-83. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman will do well, at another time, to take some opportunity to explain the trifling contradictions which appear to be involved in the several statements made by him; and when the hon. gentleman glories in the surplus he has got and calls upon us to admire him because, owing to circumstances over which he had no control, we have a surplus of \$4,000,000, or thereabouts, to-day, I, in turn, ask how that was got?