

we complained of, and I then, and have ever since, felt that it would be better for the two provinces to separate than to create sectional jealousies and strife by the demand for an increased representation, and the religious cries associated with it. For my part, I have never, like some honorable gentlemen of this House, attended and presided over that kind of political organizations known as conventions, not believing these to be the proper means of redressing the grievances under which the country labored. The effect of those conventions was to add fuel to the agitation which was already sundering the country. That such should be the result I deeply regret, inasmuch as some of the dearest friends I have in the world are not only Lower Canadians, but adherents of a different faith. The fruit of this sectional hostility and discord we now see in the demand which has sprung up for Federation with all its concomitant burdens. I can lay no blame to my conscience for having assisted to bring about so unnatural a state of things, and whatever may be the consequences of the new condition of political existence towards which we are apparently drifting, my skirts, I rejoice to say, are clear, for I have had no hand or part in it. We are told that if this scheme is carried out, Upper Canada will be entitled to the great advantage of having in the House of Commons of the Federal Government 17 additional members. But what real advantage is this to be to the country? Do we desire 17 additional members for the purpose of crushing Lower Canada—is that what is meant? I answer, no. But even supposing we have 17 additional members—supposing representation by population is conceded in the new order of things—what will be the gain to Upper Canada? Will these 17 new members cure the evils of which we complain? Will they be able to reduce the excessive expenditures under which we are now laboring, and which have been one of the causes of the agitation for constitutional changes? I do not believe a word of it. Supposing Upper Canada has a larger representation by that number than Lower Canada, you must remember that Lower Canada, with the eastern provinces, is entitled to 112 members; so that Upper Canada would still be in a large minority of the whole House. My honorable friend the member for Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) has brought before the House a number of valu-

able statistics bearing on this question, and I must say I deeply regret that the members of the Government sitting in this Chamber have not attempted to refute them. If these figures were wrong, they were easily susceptible of being so proved, especially by so able a gentleman as the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands. But he has not attempted the task, inasmuch as he knows it would be a hopeless one. I hold in my hands a statement furnished by the Auditor General to the Minister of Finance, from which it appears that our debt amounts to \$75,578,000, and deducting sinking fund and bankers' balances, \$7,132,000, leaves a balance of \$68,446,000 as the actual debt of Canada, to be borne by the people of this province under any scheme that can be concocted. If we assume that the cost of the International Railway will be \$20,000,000—and from the experience afforded by the Grand Trunk there is too much reason to fear it will be double that amount—the proportion which Upper Canada would have to bear would be \$15,000,000, and this added to the already existing debt, would make our direct debt \$83,446,000. This increase in our debt will be one of the fruits of Confederation. But it may be said that the road will yield a revenue, though every member of the House who knows anything of railway statistics, and the character of the country to be traversed by the Intercolonial Railway, must know that this is impossible. My honorable friend from Toronto (Hon. Mr. ROSS) when he issued his flaming prospectus to the capitalists of England fondly hoped that the Grand Trunk would pay 11½ per cent. on the investment. But we know how these expectations have been disappointed by the actual result, and so far from there being grounds to hope that the Intercolonial Railway will occupy a better position, there is too much reason to fear that it will be still worse. Why, the cost of its maintenance could hardly be less than \$500,000 per annum beyond all its receipts. How then could such a work be considered to be of benefit to the country?

HON. MR. ROSS—In the same way as the canals—by cheapening the cost of transportation.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—This is impossible. It costs two cents per ton per mile to move freight by rail, and as the distance from Toronto to Halifax is 1168 miles, it would cost \$2.23 per barrel to move flour from Toronto