

Sir, out of that comparatively small income of about \$10,000,000 what do we find? We find charges like these: Civil government, \$1,316,000; charges for keeping these buildings and Rideau Hall in order, lighting and warming and repairing them, \$300,000; law costs and newspapers, \$100,000; pensions and superannuation, \$326,000. That is the way that our money goes on an effective income of about \$10,000,000 a year all told. Now, I desire to say this: In my mind, looking at the real condition of our affairs, it would not be true, I have never pretended that it was true, to say that Canada had made no progress at all, or even that Canada had not made considerable progress in certain directions. In twenty-one years, or even in ten years or seven years, Canada, being such as she is, and inhabited by a people such as ours, could not fail to make some progress in some directions, no matter how bad the system of government almost, or how bad the fiscal system under which it was administered. But what I do say is, that the progress made has been partial and one-sided. It has been far below par, far less than our natural resources warranted us in expecting; and I say that whether you take as the standard of comparison, our own progress in former years, or the progress of sister colonies, such as New South Wales or any of the other Australian colonies, or if you prefer it, the progress of the United States when their population was the same as ours, or its progress at the present moment. A great deal of the progress which hon. gentlemen opposite claim is purely and simply displacement; what one man has gained has been in too many cases another man's loss. Why, Sir, but the other day the Legislature of Ontario was compelled to pass a law to prevent one town taking manufactories from another, that is, to prevent it bonusing a manufacturer engaged in business in another town to induce him to remove his factory to them, and so injuring its neighbors for its own special profit. Now, it is perfectly true, that certain towns and cities have grown, some of them considerably; and I for one do not grudge them any growth that is fairly made or due to the natural advantages of their position. I am willing to join hon. gentlemen opposite in congratulating the country on the remarkable progress made by such cities as Toronto, in Ontario, or Montreal in Quebec. But is the growth of those cities to be taken as a fair indication of the growth of the population generally? What has been the growth in the good city of Quebec or the good cities of Halifax, St. John or Charlottetown? True, some places have benefited, though quite as much, I believe, from the natural advantages of their position as from anything in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But I say that while it is very doubtful if the progress that has been made would not have been quite as great if these artificial stimuli had been withdrawn, what there can be no possibility of doubt about is this, that under the false pretext of advancing a few interests we have enormously increased our debts and our taxes, we have suffered a frightful loss of people, and we have failed to settle the new territory on which so much depends. Briefly, I say, that the policy of the Government has resulted in this: It has made a few score, peradventure a few hundreds, of men much richer than they ought honestly to have been, and has made several millions of people, from one end of the country to the other, very much poorer than they ought to be to-day. Now I am not so young a politician as not to know that for purposes of political support, and notably in Canada to-day, the rich few are able, to a very great extent, to outweigh the many. I know perfectly well that they are exceedingly useful for the purpose of supplying those necessary funds which are required to manipulate refractory constituencies. I know that they understand, and understand well, how to control the public press, aye, and how to hoodwink a

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

very considerable number of people at whose expense they are growing rich. The hon. gentleman was wise enough not to say much about another point, for I have noticed in these discussions that his friends in the House and his friends outside want to talk a great deal of the notable victory which the protective policy lately obtained in the United States, when Free Trade and Cleveland received a popular majority of 100,000 in the whole of the United States. They are very fond of pointing to the number of the seats they hold in this House as conclusive and absolute proof of their superior sagacity and wisdom. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that I know myself of twelve seats in the Province of Ontario, enough to have completely reversed their position in Ontario and most completely reversed their position in the House, if they had been transferred to where they belonged—I know of twelve seats in Ontario which were carried by a collective majority, for the whole twelve, of 383 votes. Why, I myself, my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland)—could have polled, if we had chosen to exert ourselves, an additional Liberal majority in those three constituencies, ten times greater than the whole collective majority of 383 in the twelve counties I have referred to. And that majority of 383 was obtained by bribery, by virtue of the Gerrymander Act, by virtue of Franchise Bills, by virtue of Indian votes, by virtue of public buildings, erected in places 500 or 600 strong, and by every other known means of corruption of which I have heard or read. I now come to a still more important question, and that is: What possible remedies for these evils, which have grown to such a height, can we suggest? In my opinion the remedies are two. First of all—and as to this I do not blame the hon. the Minister of Finance so much, because he is but a young member of the Cabinet, and, though he is constitutionally responsible for the sins of the Government, still he is not responsible, morally, for all of them, fortunately for himself. He would have a heavy burden to carry out into the wilderness if he were to be made the scapegoat. Now these hon. gentlemen, for their own reasons, for their own objects, have chosen deliberately to destroy the whole financial basis on which our Confederation rested, and I say there is but one remedy for that. We have now come to a point when, if we wish to establish sound relations among the Provinces of the Dominion, we must put a check on the one hand to this unfair and vexatious interference on the part of the Dominion Government with provincial rights; and, on the other hand, to the constant demand by the Provinces on the Treasury of the Dominion. I say that our present system is as bad as bad can be; I say that it is faulty in every possible respect; I say that it is unsound, both in principle and practice, and is contrary to every constitutional doctrine by which representative countries have ever been governed. What does it mean? It means that one body of men are to spend the money and another to find it. Could you devise a system which does more mischief, which gives of necessity more encouragement to bribery, which offers a more direct premium to extravagance than the policy the hon. gentlemen opposite have initiated. They were not to blame perhaps for the introduction of the system of subsidies in the first instance, because it is probable Confederation could not have been brought about otherwise; but they are to blame, and they have been to blame, after Confederation was once brought about, for destroying the financial basis on which Confederation rested. The remedy I offer is revision of the constitution. We may have to pay handsomely for past folly, but almost at any cost it is better that we should establish matters once for all on a firm and stable basis, that the Provinces should go their way and manage their own affairs, and the Dominion Parliament for the future go its way and manage