

each province would have at its disposal to carry on the local governments—the blame must rest, in a large degree, upon the delegates from the provinces, for that subsidy was fixed to a large extent upon the requirements or what we believed to be the necessities of Nova Scotia, and arranged upon a basis that we felt was necessary in order to meet local exigencies in this Province. We felt it was to the advantage of this Province as well as of British North America, that the subsidy should be placed at as low a figure as possible, for the simple reason that 80 cents a head was a tax that would rest upon the people of British North America and upon Nova Scotia in common. To have increased that subsidy to 90 cents would have made a very insignificant difference to be received by the people of this Province, but when applied to the millions of Canada it would have amounted to a large aggregate to be drawn annually for ever from the general revenue of the whole country in which we would have a common interest. Therefore it was of the highest importance to the people of this small province with a small population to fix the subsidy at the smallest amount in order to lessen the burthens which the people of British North America, and especially of the lower provinces, would be called upon to sustain. We felt that the same principle dictated to us as a matter of common prudence that we should fix the subsidy upon the census of 1861. We felt, too, that the population of Upper Canada might be expected to increase in a greater ratio than any other part of British North America, and the result would be that an enormous drain would thus be made upon the general revenue if the subsidy were not stationary. As the population increased it would be but 70 then 80, then 90 cents, instead of fixing forever 80 cents upon the people. We believed, after making a careful calculation, which it will not be necessary to go into at this time, that in fixing the amount at 80 cents we sufficiently consulted the local interests of the country, and the different services for which it was necessary to provide.

#### REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION.

I must glance now at one or two points that were arranged at that Conference for the government of British North America. The principle of representation by population was adopted, and there have been found people in this Province to question its soundness and judiciousness. It has been said that it is a false principle, and that therefore it should have been repudiated and rejected—that it was not one which Conservatives ought to support. It will not be necessary to go into any elaborate defence of representation by population, as applied to British America. That principle was approved twenty-five years ago, by a statesman as distinguished as Lord Durham. It was stated by him, in a report which will make his name ever famous in the annals of British America, and I may say Great Britain, that it was the only true and safe principle which the Legislatures and Governments could be constructed in British America. That eminent statesman predicted, 25 years ago, in reference to Canada, that, if they undertook to ignore the principle of representation by po-

pulation, the day would come when the country would be rent in twain. Who does not know the difficulties that arose from the false principle that was applied at the time of the union of the Canadas, in order to give the ascendancy to Upper Canada, whose population at the time was less than that of Lower Canada?—Who does not know that the prediction of Earl Durham has been verified? and the time has come when that country has been convulsed in order to rid themselves of a principle so unsound as that a certain number of people in a certain locality shall have an amount of representation arranged not according to their numbers, but exhibiting a disparity with some other section. But were we to put ourselves in the position of saying that the intelligence of our people was such—that the want of intellect and ability amongst us was so marked, that, in order to have sufficient influence in a legislative assembly in British North America, we should demand that the principle of representation by population should be ignored?—When it is said that the principle should be discontinued by Conservatives, I call the attention of the house to the fact that the Quebec scheme has been submitted to the most severe ordeal that any scheme of constitutional government could be subjected to, and to a tribunal perhaps as competent to pass upon it as any in the world—I mean the Government and people of England, as represented by a press which for standing, character, and intelligence is not equalled in any part of the civilized world. I ask any public man to show me, although the scheme has been rigidly examined, a single statement in the press of England, or of any other country, calling into question the soundness of the principle of representation by population, as applied to British North America. I have examined all the criticisms I could have access to, and I have yet to find a single press that has objected to the application of that principle. It has been said that, assuming the principle to be right, it would nevertheless place these provinces in a position that would jeopardise the interests of the people in connection with this scheme of government. I would ask this house to consider that, in the first place, under that principle Nova Scotia would be entitled to 19 representatives in all in a parliament of 194 members. I would ask this house, when any man ventures to question whether the 19 members or the 47, would not have a fair share of influence in the united parliament, to look at the only criterion by which it is possible to come to any conclusion on the subject. Look across the Atlantic at the parliament of England—at the House of Commons of 600 members—where the parties into which the country are divided, the Liberals and Conservatives, are separated by lines less strong than those which divide Upper and Lower Canada, and must divide them for a century to come. There you will see a dozen independent men controlling parties and influencing the destinies of the country. Is not this evidence that in a British American parliament of 194 members the representatives of the Maritime Provinces would render it impossible for their interests to be ignored or set aside. It may be said they would not be united—personal antagonism would arise to keep them divided. I grant it. But the moment that parliament would attempt to touch the interests of any part of these Maritime Provinces, would you