

in that direction is but crippling our resources and weakening us for the time of need. If these moneys we now propose to spend in that way were carefully husbanded, we will have them when the necessity arises, and be able to use them to better purpose than in defending ourselves. (Hear, hear.) Some say that Canada is defensible, and others say that it is entirely defenceless; but I apprehend that there are certain points in the country which could be so fortified that they could be held against any foe. While so held, the rest of the country would probably be under the control of the enemy, and would remain so until the fate of war decided whether we were to remain as we were or be absorbed in the neighboring union. Now, it was said by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that we are to have fortifications at St. John, New Brunswick; and if this union is to be brought about in order that we may be taxed for the purpose of constructing fortifications in New Brunswick, it will certainly be of little service to the people of Canada in preventing their country being invaded and overrun by an enemy. Fortifications in St. John, New Brunswick, would not protect us from the foe, if the foe were to come here. They, of course, would be an advantage to the country at large and aid in sustaining the British dominion in this part of the continent, and so far we would not object to contribute to a reasonable extent to an expenditure of that kind; but I do say that it would be quite impossible by fortifications to make the country so defensible that we could resist aggression on the part of the United States at every point. To endeavor to make it so would be a waste of money.

MR. McKELLAR.—What would you do then? Surrender to the enemy?

MR. CAMERON.—No, I would not.

MR. McKELLAR.—What would you do if you neither spent money nor surrendered?

MR. CAMERON.—We would do as many brave people have done before when they were attacked; and the country from which the honorable gentleman comes is a marked example of what a small nation can do against overwhelming numbers, without fortifications, such as it is here proposed to put up. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN.—It is something new that a country can be defended without fortifications. (Hear, hear.)

MR. CAMERON.—I do not know whether honorable gentlemen mean that this country is capable of undertaking the expenses that would be necessary to put it in such a state of

defence as to enable it to resist the aggression of the United States. I want to know whether with two and a half millions of people, we could cope with an army of millions—because the United States have shown that they are capable of raising such an army—or make fortifications that could resist it. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Provincial Secretary has spoken on the floor of Parliament as well as to the electors in the country, to the effect that it was retrenchment we needed more than constitutional changes; and yet now he says that the people are not to have one word to say in reference to these vital changes that are proposed, and the vastly increased expenditure that is to take place. In addressing this House in 1862, he said—"The finances of the country are growing worse and worse, and a check must be applied. It was chiefly for this cause that the people of Upper Canada desired a change in the representation." Now, I should like to understand how a union with 800,000 people, with immense expenditure, is going to improve our finances, which, according to the honorable gentleman, are "growing worse and worse." (Hear, hear.) I have not heard in what has been yet said on the subject of these resolutions, anything to show me how this great increase and improvement is going to take place by a union with less than a million of people; but arguments for the union, when directed merely to the material interests that will be served by it, are arguments ten-fold stronger in favor of union with the United States. (Hear, hear.) The arguments of honorable gentlemen all point that way, because they say it is to our interest to be joined with the 800,000 people of the provinces, who will furnish us with a market for our produce, when we have on the other side of the line thirty millions of people to furnish us a market. Arguments of this kind, urging the measure because our material interests will be promoted by it, are, therefore, arguments for union with the United States rather than with the Lower Provinces; but union with the United States, I hope, will never take place. (Hear, hear.) Still I cannot help believing that this is the tendency of the measure; for when we have a legislature in each province, with powers coördinate with those of the Federal Legislature—or if not possessing coördinate powers, having the same right at least to legislate upon some subjects as the General Legislature—there are certain to arise disagreements between the Local and the General Legislature, which will lead the people to demand changes that may destroy our connection