

Which is set off by 100 vessels.
 \$4,991,000, the value of the produce of the Colonies, which is about £125,000.
 Which leaves a balance in the favor of the Colony of £40,000.

It is well enough for those to go into Confederation who have not been able to manage their own affairs; but for us to do so in the prosperous state of our Revenue, would be but committing political suicide. Some of the delegates, however, inform us that we may obtain £250,000 to buy proprietary lands. There is nothing in the Report to this effect; all that I see promised is interest for a certain sum. If the Hon member for St. Peter was in the General Legislature, and to rise and ask for a grant of £200,000 to purchase proprietors' lands, could he have the face to point to a certain paragraph of the Report, and say I claim this sum as a constitutional right? (Laughter.) But it might be said, he would have other four members to aid him in urging our rights. Our delegates did they wish to secure our rights, had a much better opportunity to gain their point at a conference of a few individuals than in a House of 194 members. Their first object ought to have been to get a settlement of our Land Question—the only question which is a grievance in the Colony, and then they might have come with some show of reason and asked us to go into Confederation. But they ask us to give up our constitution—for what? simply the glory of belonging to a country with four millions of people? (Hoar, hoar.) I believe our people would prefer representation in the Imperial Parliament to Union with Canada, for though they might scarcely have one member in the British House of Commons, they would at least feel that their liberties were in the hands of people that could be trusted.

The Debate was then adjourned

WEDNESDAY, March 29.

Debate on Union of Colonies resumed.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—Mr Speaker. This question comes before us with a different aspect from that which it presented last Session. Last year the question of a Union of the Maritime Provinces was discussed on the suggestions of the Lieut. Governor of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. An argument has been drawn from this, that it was wrong in the Island Government to send delegates to Canada without the previous consent of the Legislature. We thought it but right to follow the example of our sister Colonies in complying with the request of Lord Monck. The number of delegates who were appointed to the Conference which sat at Charlottetown was increased by the addition of the Hon Mr. Whelan and the Hon Solicitor General. The Government had every confidence in the judgment and ability of the gentlemen whom they had appointed on the Canadian mission. Whatever might be the result of the Conference, the Government had expressed no opinion; they left it an open question, and therefore every member has a right to express his own opinion on it. It is not my intention to discuss the great principles involved, nor the various details set forth in the Report of the delegates as the result of their deliberations. In view of the thorough manner in which the subject has been handled in the press and at public meetings, it is unnecessary to enumber this debate with figures and calculations. The first consideration that occurs to my mind on the subject is the peculiar situation of the Island. We are an agricultural country, our fisheries are but partially developed. Our insular position necessitates our entrance into the Union under circumstances less favorable than either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. Canada has great resources, and her agricultural capabilities are unbounded. Nature has suited Canada and New Brunswick. It is impossible that we can participate in the advantages anticipated from the Union in proportion to the other Colonies; therefore, in my opinion, the Conference at Quebec should have treated us as

entitled to an exceptional clause in the Confederation. I do not mean to say that under no circumstances would a Union be advisable, but we should have been placed upon a different and more favorable footing than the other Colonies. I agree that the Report is an able one, but many of its details will not be convincing. As to the principle of representation by population, although not objectionable under some circumstances, yet I do not approve its application in the present matter. The representation in the Lower House should have been on the British principle, while the example afforded by the United States Senate could have been advantageously followed in the constitution of the Upper Branch of the Legislature. When my Hon and learned friend, the Hon Solicitor General, says that the delegates from the Maritime Colonies exercised a controlling influence in the framing and adoption of the Report, it appears to be an admission that they were novel principles, principles not hitherto tested by the experience of any previous Confederation of which history makes mention. It shows me that it was a plan devised to meet some complications or the particular views of some parties. The Island representatives in the Upper Branch would have some check which might tend to compensate for the unbalanced majority which we would be entitled to send to the Lower House, where a representation of £ out of 194 might render it impolitic for our members to oppose a measure they disapproved of, lest they should not be permitted to carry any vote which they might wish. I cannot see any prospect of safety for this Colony in a Legislature composed in such proportions. Canada could, at any moment, control us; now, in these war years, I suppose that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would unite to save us. But, Sir, looking at this question in the pounds, shillings and pence point of view, the scheme failed to command itself to my judgment. What are the terms proposed? We are to receive some £48,000 per annum in commutation of a revenue which has been increasing for the last fourteen years, until last year it approximated to £66,000, and which it is but reasonable to suppose, would continue to increase in the same ratio as it has manifested for the period to which I have referred. When it is asked of us that we should surrender our separate rights and submit to the terms which the proposed Confederacy may impose upon us, do hon members realize the full extent of the concession involved? We are requested to give up not merely the difference in amount of revenue to which I have referred, but matters of higher moment. We are required to yield up our position of comparative dependence as a separate Colony, and to reduce the scope of our legislative functions to the privileges of a local vestry in the Mother Country—the right of levying parish taxes for local purposes. In reference to what has been said on the subject of free trade with Canada and the benefits we would receive from it, I will take the liberty of confirming my views by extracting from the official statistics the returns of our commercial intercourse with that country for a few years. From our Public Accounts it appears that the duty paid on Imports into P. E. Island from Canada in 1863, was, as follows:

Ale and Porter	£9 8 9
Soap	2 3 8
Leather	1 18 7½
Miscellaneous	15 9
Tobacco	43 18 6
Wines	12 17 7
Tea	8 14 7½
Salt	7 17 3
Molasses	2 3 5

Total £89 7 10

Those marked thus * (evidently not the productions of Canada) paid in duty

75 6 6

Leaving for Ale and Porter, Soap, &c. the supposed produce of Canada

£14 1 4

In 1860, 1861 and 1862 the duty on Imports into P. E. Island from Canada, amounting to the aggregate value of £15 18s 6d, was only £4 5s 6d for the three years, or £1 8s 6d a year!!! Another and most important consideration is the position in which we, under Confederation, will be placed with reference to our obligation to contribute to the defence of Canada. We have been told that an army and navy must be organized for the protection of that country, for the local defence of which, in the