

federation is in danger, and unless a change takes place one can hardly say what the consequences may be. It is the duty of the hon. members of this House to speak out and defend the rights of this Province, and I ask them whether it is fair that such a state of things should continue. If we ever expect to get justice we must protest against the injustice, and we have a right to do so. We find that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has remonstrated with Sir John Macdonald; and how has he remonstrated? On the floor of this House? No, he leaves the House, and goes secretly down to Ottawa, and I can fancy him on that Sunday saying to Sir John, "Now you have seized our territory, you have seized our railway system, you have taken our licensing power, and there is a great outcry against us. Cannot you relieve us in some way of the unpopularity?" Secret remonstrances of this kind are of no effect, and if the leader of the Opposition does not make them on the floor of the House of Parliament they will be useless. But I will say this, that if he will devote as much time this session to publicly protesting upon the floor of the House that he did to privately remonstrating, he will accomplish some tangible good for his Province.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE, resuming, said—I admit that increased expenditure is a fair subject for discussion, but there are times when the interests of the country demand that there shall be expenditures over and above the average, and it is a weak Government that would refuse to make the expenditure when the circumstances demand it. Especially as in the case of our Government it can be done out of the surplus. Hon. members opposite are very fond of denouncing us when we have a deficit, and yet the time was when the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite had a deficit, and we never hear them denounced for it. I will read a statement of the deficits in the old Province of Canada:—

| Year. | Over-expenditure. |
|-----------|-------------------|
| 1853..... | \$3,375,000 |
| 1859..... | 1,494,000 |
| 1860..... | 1,975,000 |
| 1861..... | 1,999,000 |
| 1862..... | 2,064,000 |
| 1863..... | 270,000 |
| 1865..... | 380,000 |

Mr. MEREDITH—Who was in power in 1863?

Hon. T. B. PARDEE—I am glad the hon. gentleman has called attention to this. There was undoubtedly a hiatus in the increase of the deficit, for then the Reform Government came into power, and this accounts for the over-expenditure dropping from over two millions from 1862 to \$870,000 in 1863. The opponents of the present Ontario Government denounce us because there has been an over-expenditure of a few hundreds of thousands of dollars in four years, but they have not a word to say against the Government of old Canada for the deficits it relied up. I will carry the comparison to Ottawa, and I find that the expenditure of the Dominion Government for carrying on the government has increased from \$13,000,000 in 1864 to \$31,000,000 in 1884—an increase of nearly \$20,000,000. The increase in the cost of the Dominion government is always set down to the addition of new Provinces to the Dominion. Well they have added Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and British Columbia, and this I regard as a good excuse so far as it goes. But we have got the same excuse, for we have practically

ADDED NEW PROVINCES

to the old Province of Ontario. We have added what may be termed the provinces of Algoma, Muskoka and Parry Sound, and Nipissing. In 1867 the population of Muskoka and Parry Sound was 7,000, while it is now about 30,000. I appeal to the hon. member for Muskoka if this is not a true estimate—in 1871 it was 27,000. Take the District of Algoma. In 1867 the population was 7,000, and now it is 30,000. The same may be said of Nipissing, though I cannot give the exact figures. In 1867 there was hardly a person living in that vast district and now it is inhabited by many people, and there are thriving villages springing up in many places. We have created in these large districts new judicial districts, established courts for the administration of justice, with all its machinery, erected court houses and gaols, and built colonization roads necessary for the settlement of the country, and yet hon. gentlemen give us no credit for these, and assume that we should go on and carry on the government at the same cost. I say this is very unreasonable and unfair. Take the area of Prince Edward Island; it is 2,000 square miles, while the district of Muskoka and Parry Sound is over 6,000; Manitoba is 68,000 square miles in area, while Nipissing and Algoma exceed Manitoba in extent. Therefore, if the increase of the Dominion Government expenditure is justified by the addition of new Provinces, then the increased expenditure of Ontario is justified by the addition of new provinces to it. (Applause.) I would like to know how hon. gentlemen of the Opposition propose to reduce the expenditure. Do they say that we have too many schools, or that they cost too much? Or do they propose to decrease the grant in aid of education and throw the burden upon the people? If they propose that, what is it but direct taxation? Can they reduce the number of our public institutions, and throw the insane, deaf

and dumb, blind, and idiotic back upon the people and force them to take them into their homes? If they do that it will be direct taxation. Will they cripple the administration of justice by reducing the grant, or will they throw the burden upon the people? I would like them to point out what the increases are that they object to. That is the true and manly way to criticize. They complain that the surplus is not as large as it was, but I am not as much concerned about a large surplus as about it being wisely expended in the interests of the people. I would rather rest under a charge of spending the surplus than under the charge that we have not attended to the material, moral, and educational interests of this country. (Applause.) There are no charges of corruption against the present Government—none whatever. I don't take credit for this. I don't take credit because we have honestly administered the affairs of the people, because it is our duty so to do. The money we have spent was not ours, and if we have spent it well it was our duty to do so. But if we were to apply the same rule to the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are at Ottawa, where would they be? Sunk some fathoms deep in political oblivion. Why don't they apply the same rule to them as they do to us? The Dominion Government they defend in all things, and here they complain of everything whether right or wrong. Hon. gentlemen complain of the expenditure of a few thousands of dollars in law costs in connection with the Boundary question, but who are responsible for that expenditure but hon. gentlemen opposite? If hon. gentlemen opposite had stood true to their colours at the last as they did at the first there would have been no necessity for that expenditure, for I am satisfied that if they had been consistent, and had not changed their opinions there would have been no necessity for one dollar's expenditure on that behalf. (Applause.) The expenditure has been amply justified by the results. We were bound in fealty to our Province to maintain our rights, we were bound to hold our position in the territory, we were bound to hold to the territory awarded to us, and in all that we were successful, and the country would justify us if the cost had been ten times as large. (Applause.) The Opposition complain of our increased expenditures but they never are heard to complain of the manner our revenues have been depleted by the illegal action of the Ottawa Government in keeping us out of our territorial rights. Judging from an answer Sir John Macdonald has given in Parliament it is clear that he is determined to keep us out of our territory if possible and deprive us of the revenues of that country. I believe that if we were united in this House Sir John Macdonald could not longer, or much longer, keep us out of our just revenues. Sir John Macdonald and the Dominion Government can not and will not resist the united demand of the great Province of Ontario for justice. But we can hardly expect hon. gentlemen opposite to take that patriotic course after the speech made by Sir John Macdonald at the Tory Convention in Toronto. Convention called, it seems to me, for the triple purpose of ratifying the Pacific Scandal, justifying the bribers, and completing the alliance between Sir John Macdonald and the leader of the Opposition in this House. (Applause.) We may now expect that there will be a more abject submission on the part of the leader of the Opposition than he has made heretofore. We may expect that there will be no such independence as he left behind when he betrayed his convictions for the mere chance of office. The utterance of Sir John Macdonald at that convention was the most shameful ever made since Confederation. He there announced that hereafter all the influence, all the power, and all the patronage of the Dominion Government would be used for the placing of the leader of the Opposition on this side of the House. But this is only what Sir John has been doing for years, and yet this Government has not been defeated, and the shameful compact he has entered into with the leader of the Dominion Government will not help to gain the member for London the power he so much covets and which he has bartered so much for. The speaker pause.

Mr. CLARKE said it was sufficient, however, to constitute a parliamentary majority. He would ask them to look at the total vote in Ontario. Making all allowances, giving the Government the benefit of every doubt, he found that there had been cast 260,000 votes, of which 130,000 were Conservative, and as there were still two or three vacant seats the majority might be still doubtful. But the Government of Ontario had a parliamentary majority at all events, and their opponents a majority at Ottawa, so that he would like to see all disputes between the two Governments referred to a court of competent jurisdiction for final and amicable adjustment. The hon. gentleman then pointed out that the easy financial position in which the Treasurer found himself was due to the financing, to the labour and anxiety of imposing and collecting taxes born by the Ottawa Government. Yet the Treasurer had threatened to take Ontario out on strike if certain demands were not complied with. The Treasurer's speech was

ominous of a policy of disunion if opportunity offered. He thought it contrary to Ontario's interests to make a demand for increased subsidy; subsidies should be abolished altogether. As to the estimates they had no guarantee that those of this year would be any more reliable than those of last year. (Hear, hear.) Regarding assets and liabilities the doctrine of the Treasurer that only that which you have to pay on demand is present liability must be met by the corresponding doctrine; only that which you can claim on demand is an asset. (Hear, hear.) To meet the annual expenditure of \$2,870,000 they only had—deducting anything available from convertible assets—an income of only \$2,135,000. The annual deficit of \$735,000 was the rate at which they were approaching direct taxation. To meet this leak in the treasury hon. gentlemen were anxiously looking towards Ottawa, but the best remedy was to dismiss from office a mischievous and dangerous ministry.

Mr. WATERS thought every member of the House must have been satisfied with the financial statement. He was surprised at the member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) making an insinuation leading the people to doubt whether they had got back the Provincial funds. He liked a man to make a direct charge of this kind. He pointed out as one example of the fact that the money was

HANDED BACK

to the Province, that since Confederation \$6,598,251 50 had been given back for educational purposes. If anything would show extravagance on the part of the Government, it was the amount of the expenditure on civil government. In 1873 the expenditure was \$156,643 42, and hon. members would remember that there was an increase made to the officials' salaries of the Departments, with the common consent of both sides of the House at that time. In 1884 he found an expenditure of \$179,825, and the total amount was less than it was in 1883. No doubt there was an increase in the amount required for legislation. In 1882 it was \$165,000, and in 1884 \$176,000, but there were various causes for this increase. Referring to the hon. member for West Toronto's doubts about the Government having a majority of supporters in the country, he (Mr. Waters) was quite satisfied they had a majority of members in this House. He ventured to say that if any questions of public policy were to arise to-day whereby the Attorney-General would have a just claim to appeal to the people the result would be that, instead of having a majority of twelve or thirteen, he did not know whether there would be twelve or thirteen members on the Opposition side of the House. What would be their position to-day? Were the Boundary question, the Streams Bill, or the License question decided upon when they went to the people before? Not at all. Then the Opposition held that the Government were entirely wrong, but it had turned out that they were entirely right. If there were an election now, in view of these things, the Government would come back with a majority half as large again as it had at present. On the subsidy question he said Ontario was under no obligation whatever to the Dominion Government, as it only received its subsidy to the same extent as any of the other Provinces. The hon. member for West Toronto had brought charges of over-expenditure in our North-West against the Ministry, but if he had had a proper sense of decorum he would not have made this charge, because both Conservatives and Reformers in the country justified that expenditure in defending our rights. He held that it was no evidence that there was anything wrong in connection with colonization roads when several parties of the same name worked on the same job. The country was not closely settled, and there would be the different persons of the same family, who would be the only persons to do the work. He had heard no sound or good argument against that class of expenditure. It was gratifying to know that the surplus was so large an amount. Of course the balance in the bank, such as bonds, special deposits, etc., had diminished considerably, but where had the money gone to? It had gone back to the people. He explained a number of items in connection with the general expenditure to which the Opposition had drawn the attention of the House as increasing. The item for asylum attendance had doubled since 1872. He asked if any member of the House would take the responsibility of saying that this expenditure should be reduced. In what way could it be reduced? The cry had come from all parts of the Province to the effect that the asylum accommodation was insufficient for the requirements of this Province. The people of this country would not justify a decrease in this expenditure. There was no other way in which this expenditure could be met except by direct taxation, and so long as the Province was able to bear this class of expenditure just so long were the people saved from this expenditure by municipal taxation. He thought the finances were in a good position.