

1865

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTER.

43

in the Report of the Quebec Conference are just to this island. I believe them to be so. I declared myself in favor of this Report, while at the Conference, because I so believed, and Sir, I trust I have no better reason for myself to say now, that the principles of Union therein laid down are not just to this island. Because the great majority of the people regard them as just. The resolutions which form the Report, as I have already stated, are the result of a careful deliberation and discussion, and in my humble opinion are such as we should eagerly adopt. I have been told, that by advocating the adoption of the principles of the Quebec Report, I am doing myself no advantage to the people of this island, and especially of my own constituents. I can assure myself, however, of the conditions required of me, as a Representative of the people, were not which from the expression of my opinion upon a great subject deeply affecting the interests of the Colony, simply because my constituents, the people of the Colony, are supposed to entitle me to do so. The views or wishes of my constituents upon any subject, said, to themselves, have no influence upon my opinion. So far as the present debate, I believe Confederation would promote the best interests of this island. I may be aware that my constituents think otherwise, and are opposed to Confederation. My individual opinion may remain unchanged, but a knowledge of the views and wishes of my constituents, would most materially influence my conduct. Popular opinion is proverbially changeable, and I expect are long to have many of those who now denounce the Report of the Quebec Conference, admit that after mature deliberation, they have come to the conclusion that its principles are just. I regard the terms of the Report of the Quebec Conference, so far as they relate to Prince Edward Island, to be, in a financial aspect, just and even liberal. The average indebtedness of the Provinces generally, is equal to \$25 per head of the population. The debt of Prince Edward Island, in reality, but little in excess of \$2 per head. By the terms of the Report we should receive annually from the General Government the interest of an amount equivalent to \$23 per head of our population—less the interest of our actual indebtedness—or in other words we should receive annually £30,000 out of the General Government, over and above the interest upon our public debt. I shall, nonetheless, be told that under Confederation our Tariff would be raised so as to yield a revenue equivalent to \$25 per head of the aggregate population of the Provinces, and that therefore we should pay annually, in extra taxation, a sum exceeding £30,000. I, Sir, contend that, under Confederation, we should, for reasons which I have already stated, pay less in duties than we pay at present, notwithstanding the higher Tariff. If I am correct in this view of the matter, it is clear that the £30,000 a year would be gained, as a consequence of Confederation. This £30,000 a year, together with the annual allowance of 80 cents per head of our population, estimated according to the census of 1861, and a few other items, would be sufficient for our requirements. (Laughter.) But, say the opponents of Confederation, "our population will, in a few years, be double what it now is, while our income from the General Government will not increase." I think I am justified in asserting that the expense of maintaining our Government would not be materially increased, although our population should be doubled. The allowance of 80 cents per head is fixed alike to all the Provinces. When the population of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland, shall be increased to 7,000,000 or 8,000,000, those Provinces will receive no more than 80 cents per head of their population to 1861. In all the British North American Provinces, Revenue is derived chiefly from Customs and Excise. When the population of the Confederation shall be double what it now is, the consumption of articles paying duty will be vastly increased, and the revenue proportionally augmented. Reduction of taxation would follow, as a matter of course. The great Public Works of Canada will be and by be completed, her Strongholds fortified, her Canals widened and completed, and her Lakes and Rivers rendered navigable; and, Sir, I consider myself fully justified in assuming that the increase of population throughout the Confederation, and more especially in Canada, will be so rapid, the consumption of duty paying articles so great, that at no distant day the rate of taxation per head, required for the maintenance of the General Government, will be less than is now paid to Prince Edward Island, the least taxed of the Provinces. In Canada, Roads, Bridges, and other local works are not provided for from the general Revenue, as in Prince Edward Island. The alleged excessive local taxation

in some of the municipalities of Upper Canada, has been adduced, in order to terrify the people of this Island, and cause them to oppose Confederation. The people of Prince Edward Island would not be, in any degree, affected by the local or municipal taxation in Upper Canada. If it should for local or municipal purposes, be excessive in Canada, does not this fact warrant the assumption that the people of Upper Canada would pay far siller in the matter of taxation, as low as possible, the general taxation, by which alone we should be affected. Sir, I should like to be assured that there are disadvantages to which Confederation would subject us. Certainly, Sir, that we should have to pay for our Tea and Sugar, the duty we should now pay, we pay at present, and a halfpenny a yard, more for Cloth. To such disadvantages, I do not imagine there would contribute with the benefits which would result from Confederation. The old Colonies, now included in the United States of America, in little more than half a century, under Confederation, became one of the most prosperous nations on the face of the earth. Those Colonies entered upon their Confederation with no possessions, no ports, no advantages than we now enjoy. Why should not we emulate their example? Why shall we not utilize our resources, and enter upon the career of prosperity which is clearly open to us? What Confederation did for the old Colonies; it would do for us. We have Railways, and Steamboats, and machinery which they had not. We have a country in many respects equal to theirs. Are we prepared to admit that our people are inferior to the old Colonies, or to the Americans of the present day? We have hitherto imported lard, and hocks, and wooden wares, from the United States. Have we not wood wherewith to manufacture these articles? Why should we send to the United States, or across the broad Atlantic for the simplest iron castings, seeing that we export from Nova Scotia to those countries, both coal and iron? Confederation would prove our best security against foreign invasion, and preserve to us our Monarchical Institutions. I feel, Sir, that I am approaching what my eloquent friend, the member for Charlottetown, Mr. Brecken, is pleased facetiously to designate the "glory argument." I attach great importance to this glory argument. I desire to live under Monarchical Institutions, and the glorious flag of old England. Sir, there are in the House honorable members who smile when the glory argument is mentioned. Their fathers made great sacrifices in order that they might enjoy those privileges which are the inheritance of British subjects. In the Maritime Provinces are now to be found the descendants of men who left the United States upon the declaration of Independence, abandoning their property and the homes in which their children had been born, impelled to do so by the "glory argument." The American loyalists were attached to Monarchical Institutions. They valued their privileges as British subjects; and rather than become Republicans they made the greatest sacrifices, and sought new homes on British soil, in the wildernesses of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. But, Sir, to return to the commercial argument. Confederation would give us better markets than we now have for our agricultural produce. Halifax, Boston and St. John would become great and populous cities, the emporiums of trade and manufactures; and, with these capitals we have, even now, daily communication. In these cities we should find ready and greatly increased markets for our produce, and consequently should be better able to bear increased taxation, than we are at present to pay the taxes to which we are subject. Confederation would also give us the Inter-colonial Railway, with its many advantages. But, Sir, one at least of the opponents of Confederation—a gentleman high in position in this Island—has argued as a reason why we should not accept Confederation, that the Inter-colonial Railway would injure the people of this Colony. It would, says the gentleman to whom I allude, be the means of bringing under cultivation large tracts of wilderness land in New Brunswick, the produce of which would compete with the productions of this Island. The Inter-colonial Railway, argues the same authority, would afford great facilities for supplying the St. John and Halifax markets with grain and other agricultural produce brought from Upper Canada. These, Sir, are specimens of the arguments which have caused the people of this Island to regard Confederation as a project of the far West, by means of which, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the markets of St. John and Halifax with grain and other agricultural produce—potatoes—to the prejudice of the people of Prince Edward Island. In the markets of Upper Canada the prices of grain, and other agricultural products