

SATURDAY, JUNE 30.

Progress was reported on a Bill introduced by Hon. Mr. WILMOT entitled "A Bill to authorise the Extension of St. John Street."

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN asked if the Contingent Committee had made any arrangements for directing the Debates. Last year they had given at the rate of four dollars for each member; as this was to be a short Session, he did not think the House was willing to give so much. He had not yet given any order in regard to it.

Mr. SUTTON said the Chairman of the Committee was absent, or they might take the matter into consideration. Nothing had been done yet.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S RESOLUTION REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES.

Mr. SMITH resumed—I complained yesterday of the way the Provincial Secretary met this question. I think his Speech was not of that character which we had a right to expect from the position he occupies. His object appeared to be to create prejudice against my standing and position. He charged me with having brow-beat members. I then stated distinctly that it was not true. I repeat that it is a charge unfounded in fact. But if it were so, what has it to do with the question? Is not such language undignified when men's judgments are being appealed to, and not their prejudices. I consider that it was unfair, for I made no attack on him or any other member of the House. I felt impressed with the importance of the occasion, and having certain objections to the Scheme, I thought it right to lay them before the House. If they were entitled to any consideration, the Government should accord that consideration to them. The Provincial Secretary has enlarged upon the beauties of the Scheme, and I repeat: are we prepared to accept the Quebec Scheme? Several members of the House have stated they are not prepared to do so, because they have objections to it. Only two or three gentlemen have stated they were in favor of it. When Mr. Ryan stated he was in favor of the Quebec Scheme—(Mr. Ryan—I said I was in favor of a better Scheme, if we could get it; but if not, I am in favor of the Quebec Scheme,) if he has a good bargain now, why does he want any more. It is of the most vital importance, in view of future time, that in adopting a measure of Union, it should be so prepared that it would work harmoniously, and do justice to every portion of the Confederacy, or the most disastrous consequences must result. We are told that we are to get an advantage over Upper Canada, because her population increases more rapidly

than ours, and she only gets eighty cents per head on the population of 1861. That subject would be brought up in the General Parliament; and it would be said by the Canadians that New Brunswick getting eighty cents per head was unjust to their population, and they would make a grant for their proportion out of the public chest. The Provincial Secretary said I made no objections to the financial affairs in the Scheme. I stated that the principle of Union had been decided by the people, and the object of all should be to get as good a Scheme as we can. I stated that it would be unjust to the people of New Brunswick to have to pay their proportion of the expense of constructing the Canals to open up the Great West. That is part of the financial question. Every objection which I made the Provincial Secretary seemed to think no objection. If the speeches made here are read by the politicians of Canada, they will say: how can you ask for these alterations? Your Lower House approved of the Scheme because they have sent you, who thought no alterations were necessary, here to agree to the Scheme. The Provincial Secretary said it was unwise to state the policy of the Government. When this information goes to Canada, will it not excite distrust and suspicion there? Is it not an extraordinary position for the Government to take to say secrecy was the policy of the Government, lest the members of the Legislature in Canada would find out what we wanted and defeat their object. The objection to representation by population; Provincial Secretary has failed to answer. He was asked why it was that this was inserted:

"The number of Members may at any time be increased by the General Parliament—regard being had to the proportionate rights then existing."

giving the Government the power of increasing the representation independently of the decimal representation; and he passed it over with really no comment at all. When we are now to have 194 members, and an increase every decimal period: why should there be a provision made to increase the number of members *ad libitum*. This is a most dangerous principle, and would be most disastrous to us. I put it forward as a proposition that you cannot point to any portion of the British Empire where the representation is by population. When the Bills have been before the House to increase the representation of Counties, the Provincial Secretary has said himself that representation by population was not right. He has repeatedly stated that it was not a correct principle. I oppose it as a principle. It is not right as applied to a federation or Federal Government,

under the English system of Government where the whole Executive power is under the control of the people's representatives. In a Confederation under that principle the large powers often over-ride and swallow the less powerful. Under the principle of representation by population London would be entitled to send sixty-five members to the British Parliament, about one-tenth of the whole, whereas now she only sends sixteen. The principle is applied in the United States, but they have a salutary and sufficient check in their Senate. The Provincial Secretary has advanced no arguments against the objection I made, that we ought to have equal representation in the Upper Branch. If he says we have more than fair play, the Maritime Provinces having one third of the representatives; how then can he go to England and urge upon the Delegates to modify the Scheme in that respect? I believe a majority of the members of the House are opposed to the reasoning of the Provincial Secretary on that question. Statesmen should not only look to the passing hour, but they should look to the past, and judge of the future as to how any measure would practically work. I trust the Government will reconsider my objections. The Provincial Secretary seemed to take the position of an advocate, and his policy seemed to be to vindicate himself and show that the Scheme contained no defects. He arraigned and impugned the report of the Controller of Customs. (Hon. Mr. Tilley I said his figures were right, but the conclusions arrived at by persons outside were not reliable.) If he says the report is all right I will read a portion of the report. (Hon. Mr. Tilley then explained that some of the calculations were made by estimating what revenue certain articles would yield if a certain tariff was applied to them, and Mr. Smith read a portion of the report to prove that our taxation would be higher under Confederation than at present; and continued.) The Provincial Secretary says that notwithstanding Canada has no surplus, Nova Scotia no surplus, New Brunswick no surplus, we are to have the Inter-colonial Railway built. Millions of money are to be expended on the Canals. The Hudson Bay Territory is to be purchased and our taxes reduced. (Hon. Mr. Tilley, I said they would not be increased.) I think the Provincial Secretary is mistaken in that, but admitting he is not, how is it possible to incur all these expenses, without increasing our taxes. Will he pretend to say that stamp duties, on every description of taxation that exists in Canada will not be applied to us. I believe that the taxes will not only be as high as they are now in Canada, but they will be much higher if she incurs