

Branswick was in consequence of the Treaty of Washington and in lieu of revenues to which the Province was entitled. Under those circumstances he thought probably it was only reasonable that compensation should be made by the Dominion. Last session again they found the Dominion Government giving what was practically an increased subsidy to Quebec, and there was no more humiliating chapter in the whole political history of Canada than what took place on that occasion, when the French supporters of the Government met day after day in their rooms and formulated their demands and threatened to expel the Government from office unless they gave in to these demands, which were entirely unjust. It was too late for hon. gentlemen opposite to get up here and say that the attitude taken by this Government was interfering with the basis of Confederation. It was interfered with long ago by the grant given to Nova Scotia. It was further interfered with last session by the grant given to Quebec, and it was only

COMMON-SENSE

to say that if Quebec was to have these grants we must have an equivalent for the amounts which we were paying. The hon. gentleman had gone on to say that the present Government was squandering the funds of the Province, and in addition that the boasted surplus did not exist. They had heard session after session the same story, but everyone acquainted with the Public Accounts knew that the surplus was actually two millions more than it was last year at this time. It was true that portions of it were invested, but at a good rate of interest, which we could not get if we had the capital in our own hands at the present time. He pointed out that when the grant was made to Quebec last session, and when a resolution was proposed to give an equivalent to this Province there was not a Conservative in the House who did not vote against it. That was just in a line with the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They would have the Government do in this matter just as they (the Opposition) did in the boundary award and license question—fold their hands and do nothing for their Province.

Mr. CLARKE (West Toronto) quoted from the Provincial Treasurer's statement with reference to the subsidies. He was sorry that this Government seemed to have a set purpose against the Dominion authorities, and said it looked very much as if they were endeavouring to break up Confederation.

Mr. FERRIS considered that this was one of the most serious questions they had had up in this House. He would have preferred if this question could be approached on both sides with reference to the interests of the Province only. The resolution, it seemed to him, was offered as

A DEFENCE FOR THE DOMINION AUTHORITIES.

In 1869, he pointed out that in this House Mr. Blake moved a resolution opposing any departure from the financial arrangement laid down in the Act of Confederation, and Mr. Cameron moved an amendment that it should be read that day six months, which was seconded by Attorney-General Macdonald. That amendment was voted down and they the next day came down and supported the original resolution. We found

THE SAME EVILS ARISING

from departures to-day. The Reform leaders had never departed from the spirit of Confederation. From the day of Confederation down to last year this Province had never asked any increase. He was glad to hear the leader of the Opposition acknowledged that the financial basis of Confederation was not a true one. He was sorry to hear hon. gentlemen opposite placing the contention of the Provincial Treasurer in a false light. The leader of hon. gentlemen opposite at Ottawa had always been in favour of a Legislative Union, and it was he and his friends who were responsible for the attacks upon Confederation. It was quite apparent we were drifting towards a Legislative Union, and practically we had that now instead of Confederation. The system was making the burdens heavy to be borne. It was working in such a way that if the Dominion Government continued to increase the expensiveness we must before long find such a burden that neither the people of Ontario nor any other Province would be able to stand up under it. Were we, he asked, to stand idly by and not utter a word of protest? Were we not to warn the public and warn them of their danger?

WHAT WAS THIS LEGISLATURE FOR?

What did the Provinces get local government for? For the purpose of watching over the interests of the Provinces particularly. While we ought not to have any jealousy as to any other Province we must be jealous of our own rights. If this Confederation was to be lasting; if it was to go on and grow into a unified empire, perhaps eventually, it must be on a fair basis and not on a false one, which the hon. member for North Grey, Mr. Creighton, says was one now going on. He thought the House was nearer a conclusion of the matter than it had ever been since the resolution passed before.

Hon. A. M. ROSS read the extracts from his Budget Speech this year as reported in THE GLOBE, showing that he had only advocated re-adjustment of the subsidies on the ground that grants were being made to the other Provinces

in which Ontario did not participate.

The amendment was then voted on and defeated on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baskerville, Blythe, Brereton, Broder, Carnegie, Clancy, Clarke (Toronto), Creighton, Denison, Ermatinger, Fell, French, Gray, Hammell, Hess, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, Lees, McGhee, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Mulholland, Preston, Ross (Cornwall).—28.

NAYS.—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Balfantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Cook, Dill, Dowling, Dryden, Ferris, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gould, Graham, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Hart, McIntyre, Mackenzie, McMahon, Master, Morin, Mowat, Murray, Neelon, Pardee, Rayside, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Sills, Snider, Waters, Widdifield, Young—41.

The motion was carried and the House resolved itself into Committee of

SUPPLY,

Mr. Baxter in the chair.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS MAINTENANCE.

On the item Asylum for Insane, Toronto \$94,065, increase \$1,154, Hon. A. S. Hardy explained that the expenditure last year was \$96,000.

On the item, Asylum, London \$129,000, decrease, \$5,770.

Mr. MERRICK said that last year the expenditure had exceeded the estimates. If the estimates were to be of any use they must be somewhere near the correct sum required. The expenditure on the London Asylum in 1883 was \$128,000, and in 1884, \$124,000. He asked how there was to be a decrease this year.

Hon. A. S. HARDY said that they expected a saving of \$2,000 on fish, meat, and fowl. Although we took \$125,000 last year we spent \$124,000 so that they did not expend all they asked. Supplies were a little lower this year than last. Then they expected a saving of \$2,500 in flour, because wheat was very low, and \$1,000 on butter.

Mr. MERRICK complained about the excess of expenditures over the estimates generally.

Hon. A. M. ROSS pointed out that out of an expenditure of \$600,000 last year on public institutions there was only an excess of \$5,000 of an expenditure over the estimates, which showed a very close calculation.

Mr. MEREDITH pointed out the difference of the cost of heating the different asylums.

Hon. C. F. FRASER explained, that owing to the different systems of construction of these institutions, some of them were harder to heat than others, and it was impossible to make this kind of a comparison.

On the items, Kingston Asylum \$66,215, increase \$6,307, and Hamilton Asylum \$82,501, increase \$12,790, Hon. A. S. HARDY said he had not the figures of last year's expenditure, but would explain the increases on a future occasion. The items passed.

The item \$28,475, for the Asylum for Idiots at Orillia, no increase, was passed.

On the item \$73,705 for the Central Prison, increased \$550.

Mr. MEREDITH called attention to various reports of ill-treatment of prisoners, alleged to have been inflicted by the keepers.

Hon. A. S. HARDY gave an unqualified denial to the reports, and showed that any one in solitary confinement could get out by acknowledging his fault. He proceeded to state the modes of punishment, and the safeguards thrown around the prisoners in order to protect them from harsh or cruel treatment.

Mr. MEREDITH suggested that there should be a public investigation of the charges.

The item was passed.

The following items passed:—

Ontario Reformatory for Boys, Penetanguishene.....	\$38,310 00	\$400 00
Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, Belleville.....	40,067 33	218 33
Institution for the Blind, Brantford...	33,458 00	\$578 00
Andrew Mercer Reformatory and Refuge for Girls, Toronto.....	30,376,00	1,206 00

THE READERS.

Hon. A. S. HARDY brought down the correspondence relating to the change of Readers.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Hon. O. MOWAT, in reply to Mr. Meredith, stated that the Franchise Bill would probably be introduced this week.

The House adjourned at 11:45.