

raise to the priesthood in the party those who openly advocated Annexation. Nay, that divinity himself has not hesitated to serve under those red-handed from open rebellion. The hon. member from Essex has already shown that three of the prominent leaders of that party to-day—Galt, McPherson and Abbott—were open advocates of Annexation; all after this grave offence taken to the bosom of the party as chiefs and leaders, and two of them knighted on the recommendation of the Tory chief. It is matter of history that Sir George Cartier was in open rebellion, proclaimed and

A PRICE SET UPON HIS HEAD.

Y. t he was not thought unworthy to be raised to the position of high priest of the super-loyal party, nor did Sir John's sensitive loyalty prevent him from serving under him; and yet these gentlemen wish the public to believe that the nausea they profess to feel for those who desired to leave the way open to constitutional agitation for the redress of grievances is genuine and not the veriest clap-trap. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a case where a Conservative Premier secured the acceptance by a Legislature directly under his control of a resolution asserting the right of the Province to withdraw from Confederation, and threatening to do so unless certain grievances, of which the Province had, in his opinion, a right to complain, were redressed. And I never heard that he or his Conservative followers were ever read out of the Conservative party, but rather he was patted on the back and encouraged with, "Good boy, Towser!" Mr. Speaker, is it not time that this cant of super-loyalty on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and charging disloyalty on the part of the Liberal party, was put an end to and frowned down? I do not charge, notwithstanding all the instances in which they have toyed with Annexation and rebellion already referred to, that the Conservative party are disloyal. It would be criminal to do so. I believe they are as loyal as the Reform party—

NO LESS, NO MORE.

The only difference is, perhaps, that the Conservative party are more apt, when the clouds of political adversity overshadow them, to seek relief in little petulant ebullitions of temper in burning Parliament buildings, rotten-egging a Governor-General or insulting an heir apparent, but when the political sun shines out again with patronage and pap in his beams the cockles of their heart are warmed, they don their togger, shoulder their wooden gun and swagger like any Falstaff. That description of lip-loyalty is cheap, it costs nothing and its value is less than its cost. Its value is arrived at by the old school-boy rule of "take nothing from nothing and nothing remains." This description of loyalty, for which the hon. gentleman seems to have taken out a patent, is of the sarsaparilla pop variety—a little noise, a little froth, a little gas—and all the life and vitality are gone when the cork is drawn. The residue is dishwater. Now I do not say that the whole of the hon. gentleman's speech was made up of this fustian. Some of it was legitimate argument, and he can be argumentative and logical when he likes; but I do say that the leading characteristic of the speech was not an effort to consider the propositions on their merits, but a set determination to lead the discussion into party lines and to have the resolutions treated in a partisan spirit, and this loyalty cry and waving of the flag episode was either merely a device to draw a herring across the scent or an involuntary drop into an old rut which from force of habit he could not resist. So much for this loyalty cry. Let us now get down to business. And before entering upon that branch of the subject which I intend mainly to deal with—the financial—let me for a moment touch upon one other of the resolutions. I mean that regarding reform of the Senate. The Hon. the Attorney-General has frankly admitted that instead of the proposition contained in the resolution he would have preferred to

ABOLISH THE SENATE ALTOGETHER.

In that view many on this side of the House and no doubt some on that would concur; but one Province cannot get everything its own way. The Senate was designed for the protection of the smaller Provinces, not the larger, and for that purpose they were given a proportionately larger representation in it. The question is, Is it fulfilling, as now constituted, this main purpose of its existence? Is it representative of the Provinces? No one would have the hardihood to say it is. It is only representative of the Government and party who for the time being has the power of making the appointments, and in making the appointments there has been a glaring and dishonorable departure from the express promises and agreement upon which the consent of the representatives of Canada was obtained to this mode of appointment. Let me quote the 14th resolution to show the spirit in which it was proposed these appointments should be made. Now in that resolution the leading objects are:—1st. That the Local Governments in each Province

shall have the nomination of who shall be the representatives of the Provinces, and that is reasonable. These Local Governments are constitutionally and logically presumed to rightly represent the people of the Provinces, and are the best fitted therefore to nominate the Senators who are to represent the Province. 2nd. That both political parties shall as nearly as possible be fairly represented. But hon. gentlemen may say, Oh, that was only to apply to the first appointments. But even if there had been nothing more it logically follows that if it was right and proper that the Provinces should have the right of nomination in regard to the first appointment, so that the appointees should be actually representative, it is equally right and proper that they should have the same right in future appointments; also, if it was equitable and fair that all political parties should be fairly represented in the first constitution of the Senate, it is equitable and fair that an equitable principle should be carried out in subsequent appointments. Mr. Ross said that the Conservative Government during their last periods of office had appointed 31 Senators, of whom 30 were Conservatives and one was a Liberal. (Applause.) Eight Conservatives had been appointed almost immediately after their rejection by the people of this country. Thus Mr. J. B. Plumb was made a Senator in February, 1883, having been defeated at the previous general election. Mr. O'Donohoe had been made a Senator after being rejected three times by the people.

Mr. MEREDITH—A Grit candidate.

Mr. ROSS said that Mr. O'Donohoe was considered a very good Conservative before he attacked Sir John for breaking his promises to him. Mr. O'Donohoe used to interfere even in local elections, and had frequently spoken against him in the local election in 1883. Then there was Mr. J. G. Ross, who was raised to the Senate after being rejected by the people in 1873.

Mr. MEREDITH—He was not defeated. He was a member of the Legislative Council.

Mr. ROSS read from The Parliamentary Companion, "Unsuccessful candidate at general elections in 1873 and 1873." (Cheers.) Mr. Merner, of Waterloo, was recently appointed after two defeats in Parliamentary elections.

THE FINANCIAL RESOLUTIONS.

He regretted that the criticisms on the financial resolutions had been such that he had almost to apologise to the House for replying to them. For instance, the member for Toronto (Mr. H. E. Clarke) said that when the population of the Dominion grew to 7,000,000 or 8,000,000, \$3,000,000 would be required to pay the subsidies, and he asked where it was going to come from. The possibility was so remote that it was hardly worth while to consider it; for if the population of the Dominion increased at the same rate as during the last ten years it would be 70 years before they were called upon to consider the question. But if they must look so far into the future, they would see that at the rate of increase of the past 20 years the taxation of the Dominion would increase in the next 70 years from \$28,000,000 to \$105,000,000, the expenditure from \$35,000,000 to \$122,000,000, and the debt to \$670,000,000; so that the increase in the subsidy would be a mere drop in the bucket. The fact was the hon. gentleman's criticism was so ridiculous that he must have laughed at it himself. In the

ORIGINAL TERMS OF CONFEDERATION

it was a part of the scheme that the smaller Provinces were entitled to some consideration beyond the grant given in proportion to population, and the allowances for civil government and legislation were proportionately greater in the smaller Provinces than in the larger. Under the original scheme the grants were as follows:—

	Subsidy.	Allowance for Civil Govern- ment, etc.
Ontario	\$1,115,872	\$83,000
Quebec	889,252	70,000
Nova Scotia	331,035	60,000
New Brunswick	201,637	50,000

These amounts were embodied in the Imperial statute, and they were declared to be final and unalterable. But they did not remain unaltered. In 1869 a special grant was given to Nova Scotia of \$59,337 for ten years, with a declaration that this was to be final. In 1873 an annual grant of \$150,000 for all time to come was given to New Brunswick. This was given under the pretext that it was a purchase of the right of New Brunswick to levy an export duty on lumber passing over the St. John. But the facts showed that this was a mere pretext. The amount collected by New Brunswick for export duty was \$79,000; in 1854 it was \$82,000. After the duty had been removed the amount collected was \$65,922, so that there was a loss of only \$17,000 a year from the removal of the duty. And yet in consideration of this they obtained a grant of \$150,000 a year for all time to come. Then during that same year (1873) the balance of the debt of old Canada, Ontario and Quebec—\$10,560,000—was assumed. They took care

not to deal with Ontario and Quebec as with New Brunswick; but they felt that the other Provinces were entitled to an increase whenever an increase was given to Ontario and Quebec. During the same year the grant to New Brunswick was made permanent. In 1876 a grant of \$26,746 was made to Manitoba for six years, and in 1879 the grant was again increased by \$15,000. In 1882 the subsidy to Manitoba was further increased to \$109,347, and her allowance for civil government and legislation was increased from \$13,000 to \$50,000, while the 30 cents allotted to her by population was given upon a fictitious population of 150,000, while her real population was 65,000. In the same year Manitoba was granted a further sum of \$45,000 in lieu of public lands. In 1884 a reimbursement was made to Ontario and Quebec for the interest that they paid upon the surplus debt assumed by the Dominion in 1873; but care was taken that the other Provinces of the Dominion should receive an equivalent. During the same year a grant of \$2,396,000 was given to Quebec as a return for Provincial aid given to local railways, while not a dollar went to Ontario. The circumstances of the grant to Quebec are well known; it was to a large extent the result of the celebrated meeting in room 8, when it was said that the C. P. R. resolutions would not carry unless the grant were made to Quebec. The fact was that the only case in all the departures from the original scheme of Confederation in which

ONTARIO HAD RECEIVED ANY BENEFIT

was in the assumption of the surplus debt. In 1885, again, Manitoba was granted important additions, as follows:—First, all the swamp lands of the Province; 2nd, 150,000 acres of good land for the university; 3rd, her allowance for lands was raised from \$45,000 to \$100,000 a year; 4th, an increase of 80 cents per head of the population was allowed every five years; and 5th, \$3,113,333 was added to her capital; or besides the land she was granted a cash addition of \$210,000. Then and lastly, in 1887 Prince Edward Island was granted \$20,000, and was now asking for more. In connection with the grant of land to Manitoba he would repeat that he thought it reasonable that that Province should have certain concessions, but the concessions made had been more than generous, and virtually amounted to a grant of \$100,000 a year for all time, putting it in a far better position in regard to land revenue than any other Province in the Dominion, or an income from that source of \$1 50 per head as against 40 cents per head for Ontario; besides which it was to be taken into account that the land revenue of Manitoba was subjected to charges for management as was that of the older Provinces. Now, in reciting these various grants and subsidies to the different Provinces we were not arguing that in every case they were

NECESSARILY CORRUPT OR UNJUSTIFIABLE.

The impecunious position of many Provinces, no doubt, necessitated relief in some form or other from their financial embarrassments, and the political necessities of the Dominion Government made it difficult to resist their appeal. His purpose was to point out that such a system of capricious assistance was pernicious in principle, improvident in effect and unjust to Ontario. (Applause.) But the injustice to Ontario had not been confined to this system of direct or indirect subsidies to other Provinces. There was another system which had been lately inaugurated which was working just as disastrously to Ontario's interests as were those he mentioned. On a former occasion he had drawn attention to the policy of the Dominion Government in giving subsidies to local railways and had shown how unfair was the result to Ontario, owing to the manner in which the Government distributed those subsidies to the different Provinces. Another year's experience had only aggravated the injustice that existed on the occasion of his former remarks. What was the result? What were the facts at the present time? An investigation into the matter showed the total railway subsidies voted by the Dominion Government since 1882, when they were first established, to be \$21,627,365, distributed in the following proportion to the different Provinces:—Nova Scotia, \$2,711,000; New Brunswick, \$3,506,600; Quebec, \$3,506,600; and Ontario, only \$3,641,200. Was this fair or just to Ontario? New Brunswick, with a population of only 323,000 or so, received as much as Ontario, with over two millions of people. Now, the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, had stated in his speech that it was not profitable or politic for Ontario to seek to increase her subsidy from the Dominion Government for the reason that Ontario was at present paying two-thirds of the revenue of the Dominion, and would lose more than she would gain by such an increase. (Hear, hear, from the Opposition.) Hon. gentlemen opposite said hear, hear, from which it appeared that they had committed themselves to that opinion. So much the worse for them.