

"The King of France with twenty thousand men,
Marched up the hill and then marched down again."

It has been stated that those gentlemen who have taken a prominent part in advocating this Scheme, are consulting their own interests by so doing; it is that an argument to be used against Confederation, it might as well apply to the people who voted for Union, which was to make these united Provinces one of the brightest jewels in the British Crown, because by doing so they are advancing their own interest. The hon. member from St. John (Mr. Anglin) alluded to conspirators, and hidden intrigue. Now, I know no such imputation applicable to any of the delegates; it is true: it was rumored at one time that a countryman of the hon. members, and a man of brilliant talents, Mr. D'Arcy McGee, was at some former period of his history concerned in seditious movements in Ireland; that gentleman has made the *ancient honourable*, and has well redeemed his character for loyalty. Conspiracy! treason and stratagem! cries the hon. member. My belief is, that if there exist any treasons and stratagems, they are connected with the *epoch* at the present time. It is all a false alarm. Like Shakspear's Macbeth:

"Is this a dagger, which I see before me,
The handle toward my hand? Come let me clutch thee:
I have thee not, and yet I see thee still.
Art thou not, fatal vision, sensible
To feeling as to sight? or art thou but
A dagger of the mind; a false creation,
Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain?
I see thee yet, in form as palpable
As this which now I draw."

There is nothing to be gained by sending this delegation to England to express the state of public feeling, because that expression is known there, and it has been stated in the London *Times* that there is no intention to coerce the people of this Province. Then why is it that 150,000 Confederates are to be taxed to send a delegation home to misconstrue their opinions? What great measure, in so short a period of time has ever taken such a firm hold upon the people of the country as this has? This great measure, improving the constitution of a country, has received the approval of nearly one-half of the people of this Province, and in a short time there will be a majority in favor of it. We have shown that this Confederation would be a benefit to the people of this Province, politically, commercially, financially and socially; therefore this delegation is unnecessary. If these resolutions had to be passed in the Legislative Council, they would probably meet with the same fate as other measures that have been tried to be foisted upon the country during the present year. We are not in a position to express, by a delegation of this Legislature, the exact state of public feeling which now exists, and which will exist six months hence. A large majority of British North America have spoken out in favor of this Scheme; we are not in a position to express our views; we have placed ourselves right in regard to our loyalty by voting \$30,000 for Militia purposes; we are ready to cover our position, and there is no need of sending two or three men home to tell them what they know already. Unless we can do a noble deed, in haste, let us be silent.

Mr. OTTAWA.—I think—part of the action from Shakspeare's Macbeth.

friend has made is very applicable to the Scheme of Confederation, for I think Confederation is

—"a false creation,
Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain."

I do not think it necessary to take long to discuss this subject. Some years ago, when a proposition was made by Mr. Howe for a Union of the North American Colonies, I thought it would be a benefit to us; by raising these Provinces into a nationality. I was glad also when I heard that this delegation had proceeded to Quebec to take into consideration this question; but afterwards on reflection I thought there would be found something wrong in the details of the Scheme, for those thirty-three men had taken only seventeen days to consider a subject of such vast importance, and those days were interspersed with feasting. This was a very short time compared with the time taken by the United States to frame their Constitution, they being four months in actual session, therefore, I considered there would be some details in the Scheme that would not bear the light. I was more confirmed in this view when I read the resolutions which they had adopted carefully and considerably, for I found that New Brunswick would be swamped in the Legislative Assembly, we being only allowed the small number of fifteen members, the whole number of members being 194. But the advocates of the Scheme say there is a check to this influence in the Legislative Council; but if you read the 14th Section of these resolutions you will find only the first selection of Councillors are to be taken from the Legislative Councillors of the Provinces, and any subsequently appointed may be selected from Canada to represent the Lower Provinces. The 10th Section says: "Each of the twenty-four Legislative Councillors representing Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Assembly shall be appointed to represent one of the twenty-four Electoral Divisions, * * * and shall reside or possess his qualification in the division he is appointed to represent." That clause affects Lower Canada only. The Councillors of every other section of the Union may be appointed—after the death of the present Councillors—from the residents of Canada. That is a very serious defect in the Scheme, for it allows Councillors to be selected from any district, and they may have no interest in the Province they represent. In the United States their Senators are elected from their representatives, and they are well fitted to represent their own particular State. It is said that the people are not educated on this subject. In the County of King's, during the late election, every means was taken to provide information for the people, and it speaks well for that County, that when I, a new man who had never taken any interest in political life, came before them as a candidate for their suffrages, they returned me, giving me nearly 300 votes over their favorite candidate, who had represented them so many years. This shows the opinion of the people in that County on Confederation. To go over all the arguments against this Scheme would take more time than we have at our disposal; but there is one particularly objectionable, that is the 51st Section. According to that, any law which we may pass, if it happen to conflict with the interest of Canada, can be disallowed at any time within one year after it has passed our Legislature. We give up the right of taxation, over

which we have no control, for it would pass into the hands of Canada, and she could use such a system of taxation as she pleased. We get eighty cents per head for giving up all our revenue. This is not enough to support our roads, schools, and bridges, therefore we will have to resort to direct taxation.

Mr. HILL.—I rise for the purpose of replying to some of the remarks made by my hon. friend from the County of Albert, (Mr. McClellan). I do not intend to go over the whole, for at least two-thirds of his speech has been upon matters entirely foreign to the subject under consideration. He has dealt with matters connected with himself and the President of the Council; it will not be expected that I will follow him upon those points. I will reply now to one allusion which he made. He advised the delegates to extend their trip to Africa. I think that comparison will scarcely apply, because even under this Union these little courts will be held, having less influence than they now have. His proposed Confederation will be very much like the case of Austria, which is burdened down by a heavy debt which has not been caused by external war, but by internal dissension. The Empire is composed of Provinces, with different interests and different languages, and they do not work harmoniously together. We find Hungary and Italy breaking out into rebellion; we find the country loaded down with debt, simply because they are confederated together, with no interests in common, but alienated one from another. He (Mr. McClellan) said that the delegation had as much right to confer on a Union of the Colonies making a total change in our position as a people, as a delegation had to go to England to make arrangements on railway matters. If a delegation went to England to make arrangements on railway matters, it was to make arrangements for the construction of a railway, already authorized by the Legislature, and had there been the subject of discussion. It was entirely different from the delegation going to Quebec to take into consideration the making of arrangements which were to change our whole political condition. I have doubts as to the constitutionality of the course taken by the late Government and delegates in this matter. The hon. gentleman says we have not a written Constitution, and it is liable to be changed—every Act of the Legislature being a change. This is true, and it is true of the British Constitution; but was any Constitution ever changed by the action of self-appointed delegates. My hon. friend says this Scheme was defeated on account of the unpopularity of the Government. This has only lately been discovered.

Mr. McCLELLAN.—I did not make that statement. I was replying to a statement of the President of the Council, and I said that as a distinct question outside of politics, when the people understood it, they would sustain it by a large majority. Mr. HILL.—With regard to the unpopularity of the Government, I do not know whether they had any influence in the County of Albert; but I know Confederation received a large amount of support from the people throughout the Province in consequence of the influence of the Government. I do not accuse that Government of sinister motives. I do not believe they really wanted to sell the country; and I think that if they had believed that the measure would really have been injurious, they would not have urged it upon the country; but I believe the views of men are modified by views of