

The very fact of the scheme coming in that way to a free people is enough to make them reject it. Those delegates have been compared to the men who signed the declaration of independence in the United States. Those men took their lives in their hands, and looked forward to jails and gibbets. Did those men who went to Quebec and sat seventeen long days in concocting this scheme to ruin us, take their lives in their hands? I rather think they had a jolly good time; champagne in the morning, sherry in the afternoon, toast in the evening, and glorious times all the way through. The Canadian politicians looked out for themselves. They were justified in doing so, and I find no fault with them for doing so, but I find fault with the delegates from the Maritime Provinces that they appended their names to such a scheme. Look at it, read it, and understand it. The 64th Section says:—"In consideration of the transfer to the General Parliament of the powers of taxation, an annual grant in aid of each Province shall be made equal to eighty cents per head of the population." All our revenues go to Canada. Those revenues amount in round numbers to a million dollars a year, and are collected at the different custom offices in this Province, and the moment it is deposited it finds its way into the great maw of Canada. Where are our eighty cents? Up in Canada, and we have to get it by an annual vote of Parliament, where we have fifteen members out of one hundred and ninety-four, and they tell us that is the best scheme they could get. Suppose this great confederation scheme is carried, and in our Legislature we make a law that cows found on the commons shall be impounded, that law has to be taken to the General Parliament to get their sanction. They come down and say we want to extend our territory and buy the North Pole, and we want \$3,000,000 a year, are you prepared to tax New Brunswick for that? No! Then you shall not have your cows impounded. Is that all? No. You shall not have your eighty cents per head. Could not the Delegates have made a clause in the constitution, that the different Provinces should, by a warrant on their treasury, draw that amount before it went to Canada? Ought they not to have had it when they are giving away a million dollars a year to Canada, and if this Confederation increases the population of this country, as they say it will, our revenues will be increased, and in a few years we will have two millions to send away, but we only receive back the same \$200,000 for the support of roads, schools, militia, and the expenses of the local Government (if Parliament chooses to give it). If these Maritime Provinces were united to Canada under that scheme, the men that originated and sustained it, had better clear out of the country before fifteen years, for they would not be tolerated here, after having absolutely sold us. I do not believe any man in New Brunswick when he reflects upon that clause in it, allowing them to give us \$200,000 or not, just as they please, would go for confederation. Another objection to this scheme is, that two languages are to be used. One-half of the members will get up and jabber French, and not one of our members will understand what they are saying. The courts of law are conducted in French too. In Lower Canada one lawyer talks to the jury in French and another in English. This is a system with which we want nothing to do.

It was asserted here during the election, that by going into confederation they secured the seat of Government in Fredericton for all time to come. My hon. colleague (Mr. F.) heard that assertion made by a gentleman who was lecturing for his benefit, and by his silence gave consent to it. If we look at the fifty-third resolution, we will find that the seats of the local Governments shall be as at present subject to any future action of the respective local Governments. This gentleman had the abominable audacity to declare in the face of his own resolution—which, as Mr. Cartier says, was signed by him and sworn to—that the seat of Government was fixed for ever. We can imagine that these Canadians saw the difficulty about the eighty cents, and they said let us put a bait on the hook to catch these lawyers. A resolution was inserted stating that "until the consolidation of the laws of the different Provinces, the Judges of these Provinces shall be selected from their respective bars." That consolidation will take place when it suits the convenience of the Canadians, and then the Bench of New Brunswick will be filled with Canadian lawyers. The bait was so thin that it showed the hook, and they did not catch all the lawyers. It seemed to be the desire to inveigle Canada with all the power they possibly could. It is hard in that scheme to define the power given to the local Parliament, or whether they have any power at all. The General Parliament shall have power to make laws regarding public debt and property, the regulation of trade and commerce, the regulation of duties and the raising of money by all or any other modes or systems of taxation. This is like the Calvinistic theology. It must have been a lawyer that drew it, who was thinking of the old form of indictment, which names every part of the body, and then says all other parts. This General Parliament will have the power to tax by all or any other modes of taxation. There is something underneath this that has not been let out. Why did our great statesmen who have been held up as the very "colons" of this age, let them put in such a clause as that. Mr. Galt, in speaking to his own people, says "that a union of the Provinces will relieve Canada from distress and depression, for at this moment Canada, standing alone, her credit is seriously depressed, but if Confederation is gone into, we will have larger means to pledge for the security of the public creditor." They want us to pay for their defalcations. No wonder there is a dead lock. We go into Confederation with a debt of \$7,000,000, and Canada goes in with a debt of \$62,000,000, and they claim actual assets valued at \$70,000,000, from which they, two or three years ago, received a return of \$471,461, which is a little more than one-half per cent. It follows as a necessary consequence that a great part of that debt is represented by unproductive public works, and a large proportion of bad debts, which is no property at all. This is not a declaration, but is the honest truth. The debt of this Province is \$3,800,000. We have nothing to show for \$800,000 of this, but for the \$5,000,000, we have a Railroad paying \$40,000 per annum over and above working expenses, and when Eastern and Western Extension are built, which time is not far distant, it will be a paying property. This is acknowledged by every

man who pretends to know any thing about Railroads. If we go into Confederation, Canada assumes her portion of our debt of \$7,000,000, and we give her property equal in value to it. At the same time we assume our proportion of her debt of \$62,000,000, for which she gives us \$70,000,000 of unproductive property, part of which is comprehended in the Grand Trunk Railroad, built by money siphoned from the widow and orphan at home, and that money has never been repaid, and never will be. If we had a railroad built in that way I would railroad it out of existence. How was that money obtained from them? Pamphlets were written to induce the people of England to think this road would pay ten per cent., and the widows and orphans of brave soldiers who fell defending the honor of old England, withdrew their money from the three per cents at home, and invested it in the Grand Trunk Railroad. Hundreds of those widows are now living by the bounty of the British Government, and have become the tenants of the work houses and poor-houses at home, while Messrs. Galt and Brown are re-rolling in their money in the Grand Trunk Railroad. Our taxes averaged 12 per cent., and our revenue is \$1,000,000, while Canada's taxes average 20 per cent., therefore, if we bring our taxes up to the taxes of Canada, we would still have to pay it all to Canada, yet we would only get the same \$201,000 back. This I think would be very unfair. We have been charged with exaggeration about Canada. I will read an extract from a speech by Mr. Dunkin, in the Canadian Parliament:

"I do not care to see Upper and Lower Canada more dissevered than they are. On the contrary, I wish to see them brought into closer union, and I am far from regarding this scheme as cementing more closely the connection of these Provinces with the British Empire. I look upon it as tending rather towards a not distant disunion of these Provinces for the British Empire. I look upon it as tending rather towards a not distant disunion of these Provinces from the British Empire."

Here the cry was you do not want to preserve the union with the Mother Country, because you do not go into Confederation. That is not only the language of Mr. Dunkin, but it is the language of the *Edinburgh Review*, which is edited by the most talented men in England, and they regard this Scheme as a direct strike at independence from the Mother Country. Mr. Dunkin says again:

"And now what have we? Why, the cry that the whole thing must be passed, now or never. It will never pass, we are told, if it does not pass now. Was there ever a measure of this magnitude before, on which the heart of a country was set, the whole of which was so wise and good as this scheme is said to be; and yet that had to be passed (the whole of it) now or never? We are even told that it is a positive treaty, made, however, by the way, by parties who were never authorized to make any treaty at all. I must say, for one, that I cannot see in all this precipitancy the unmistakable admission *de facto* that the Government themselves know and feel that the feeling they have got up in favor of this scheme is a passing feeling