

for the poor Province of Ontario. I thank him for his consideration when, in expressing the hope that the article of coal should be admitted free into the United States, he coupled with it the reservation that he would have regard for the Province of Ontario, and that he should not like to have the price increased there by the removal of the present duty on that article imported from the United States. I do not know whether the hon. member's remark was serious or a joke. If a joke he will allow me to say that it was not a very good one; if serious, I will not waste time upon it. To go a little farther west than Montreal, take the town of Cornwall, one of the glories of the National Policy, a place the hon. Minister of Finance was good enough to visit shortly after the election of 1882, and find what the condition of the main industry in that town is. Go to the City of Kingston, to Cobourg, to Oshawa; go even to Toronto, which has exceptional opportunities of prosperity and growth, and which has fortunately only a few protected industries. It is true we have a couple. We have the bolt works, but they are shut up—yes, they bolted, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) says; we have also the glucose works, but they were never opened. Other industries we have, and they are in a happier condition. Then take Hamilton, Dundas, London, St. Catharines, Guelph, Chatham—it would be too tedious, Sir, to prolong the list, but with very few exceptions you will find that the story of the cities and towns and industrial centres of Canada is the same everywhere. It varies in degree, but it is the same in kind; it is one of difficulty and depression instead of life and animation. No wonder. The hon. gentleman, as I have said, has done what he could to disarrange the natural progress and growth of these industries, and we have in the lumbering industry, the farming industry and, notwithstanding the statements of the hon. member for Cumberland, the fishing and shipping industries, great sources of difficulty, owing to this process of disarrangement. You could not give that permanent prosperity you talked of, but you could take it away, you could shorten it, and that you have done. The Speech rather regrets than otherwise the diminution in imports, but it announces, I observe, that notwithstanding that circumstance and notwithstanding the lessened prices and volume of imports, the revenue exceeds the expenditure. At the close of the financial year a surplus was announced of about \$1,600,000—\$700,000 from the other sources of the revenue and \$900,000, in round figures, from Dominion lands. The expenditure on Dominion lands was omitted, and I am afraid it was very large, but as the hon. gentleman charges it to capital account, he finds it is of no account at all. We borrow the money to pay for the expenditure on Dominion lands which I am afraid was about \$700,000. This would leave a modest margin of \$200,000 as the net revenue from Dominion lands instead of \$900,000: or if you leave your revenue from Dominion lands intact, it would absorb the surplus from all other sources. Perhaps I am uncharitable, but I suspect the hon. gentleman of having put to capital account some of those railway aids which we have been granting so lavishly out of our revenues, from time to time, until to-day; and I shall look with some anxiety for the production of the Public Accounts to see whether this surplus, small as it is, compared with former surpluses which the hon. gentleman gloried in, is real or in large part fictitious. With reference to the question, adverted to in the Speech, of the lessened price of imports, it is to be remembered that that circumstance is not of such great importance under the present as under the old *ad valorem* tariff, because there is now a very large proportion of the duties specific, and you pay the same duty to that extent, however cheaply the goods may be bought. But this is also to be remembered, that your revenue—although you very nearly produce an equilibrium—is still very large. In 1879 and 1880 the imports were from eighty-two to

eighty-six and a half million dollars, and the hon. Minister said they were too large and ought to be reduced. He said that one of the great sources of evil and difficulty in this country had been the expansion of imports; he congratulated us on their being down to these figures, but he wanted to break them down still further in order to make things safe and tidy and comfortable. Now in this year of reduced imports they are still \$30,000,000 to \$35,000,000 more than they were in the year when the hon. gentleman said they were too large, so that it is not for you, whose policy it was to make the imports smaller than \$85,000,000, to congratulate yourselves, because they are \$35,000,000 more than what you said was too much. If, on the one hand, the imports have decreased and the revenue has diminished, on the other hand the hon. gentleman is getting back slowly to his policy which was to have less than \$85,000,000. But about the same time the hon. gentleman denounced the adverse balance of trade and gloried very much in the circumstance that in one year that adverse balance had been turned the other way, and I recollect well how the Ministerial organs generally crowed over that event. The good time had come and we were going to keep it up. We were going to keep up our exports and to keep down our imports. Well, that has not happened. At the time that the hon. gentleman said he did it, he had succeeded, in pursuance of his policy, in so arranging that he had, I think, one or two millions excess of exports over imports and he was happy. But if his policy is to be measured by his statement at that time, what sort of value must be given to it when there is an adverse balance of \$25,000,000? In 1878 he declared \$13,000,000 was about the sum required for Customs duties to carry on the public service, and in 1881 he gloried in having obtained a revenue of eighteen and a-half millions, which was a very handsome revenue and produced a very large surplus. This year the hon. gentleman has a Customs revenue of more than twenty millions, or more than one and a-half million greater than in the year 1881, when he got this eighteen and a-half millions which produced so large a surplus as the surplus of that year. Yet we learn now that the hon. gentleman almost seems to regret the revenue is reduced, and says that notwithstanding its reduction he is still able to produce a modest surplus. Well, I admit the growth of Canada in one respect; we have grown in many things, in various degrees, but there is one thing alone in which it may be said we have grown enormously—a growth, I think, almost too great to be natural and wholesome, though the hon. gentleman has thought differently. What I refer to is the amount of money we take out of the people in the way of Customs—an amount which has increased 50 per cent. Whether we have grown equally in any other respect, except in our ability to extract from the people their national life, I leave to the most ardent supporters of the Government, not to assert but to establish. Our public debt has increased very largely; we shall get the account very soon. With the engagements of the year preceding, and looking to those engagements which are to be added in the coming year, it is clear that there must be an increase of the public debt to a very large extent. That general result affected our credit. Notwithstanding the great commendation of hon. gentlemen opposite on the great loan, we find it drags; we find that it is a drug in the market; we find it stated in an important London paper the other day that a portion of it was taken by a few persons who hold it still, as they have been unable to unload. And that is the condition of things, arranged by the hon. gentleman, in which we have to effect the important operation of exchanging a very large proportion of our 5 per cent. debt in a very few months. I hope, however, Sir, that whatever else the hon. gentleman may have done with reference to our finances, he has been more careful of his