

Confederation will not make us a stronger or a greater people than before. Then it is said that in our present exigencies we must look out for other markets for our produce than those we have been depending upon; that we must endeavor to become a manufacturing country, obtaining minerals from the Lower Provinces and sending them our produce in return. That is all very fine, but it can be accomplished without entering into an extravagantly expensive arrangement such as this is. We could have a legislative union with one Legislature or Central Government, that would manage all our affairs on a scale as economical as the affairs of the province of Canada have been conducted; but when you provide for a General Government, and then for a Local Government in each province besides, it stands to reason that the expenditure must be far in excess of that which would result from having a single legislature. The Hon. President of the Council has said that he is not, although all his other colleagues who have spoken on the floor of the House have admitted that they are, in favor of a legislative union, if this union could be accomplished. The Hon. President of the Council thinks, perhaps, that this would be too damaging an admission, so he says: "I would not have a legislative union if I could. There is nothing but a Federal union for me, because our country is so extensive that it would be impossible to control it with a Legislature sitting at Ottawa." Now, is this so? Would four or five hundred additional miles of territory make all the difference?

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I never used any such expression.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Of course it is very unpleasant to have to say it, but my ears must have deceived me very grossly indeed, if the hon. gentleman did not assert in the hearing of persons in this House, when delivering his address on these resolutions, that he preferred a Federal union, and assigned as a reason for his preference the extent of the country.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman will see that this is a very different thing from the statement he previously made. What I did say was this, that it would be exceedingly inconvenient to manage the local affairs of so widely extended a country. I did not say that we could not

exercise a general control over the country. I said that it was impossible to attend to the mere parish affairs of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and the North-West. That is what I said.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Well, one reason assigned by the hon. gentleman for a Federal union was that in attending to the private business of the Lower Provinces, under a legislative union, we would be kept sitting at Ottawa for nine months of the year. It is, however, the case that the affairs of United Canada can be transacted in a period of three or four months, while according to the Hon. the President of the Council, the affairs of the federated provinces would not be attended to in less than nine months in consequence of the private business which would be added to the legislation from a people numbering only seven or eight hundred thousand. (Hear, hear.) The business of two and a half millions can be disposed of in three months, whilst it is alleged that the business brought by the addition of seven or eight hundred thousand more would prolong the sessions of Parliament by six months. (Hear, hear.) I think that the position which the hon. gentleman took in reference to that, is just as untenable as his position that a Legislative union in itself would not be better than a Federal union. Now, it is said that our commercial affairs will be very much advanced by this arrangement. It is said that the Reciprocity treaty is going to be abrogated. No doubt we have received notice of it. It is also said that it is possible—although the Hon. President of the Council does not think it is so—that the bonded system is to be done away with between Canada and the United States, and that, therefore, we would have no means of reaching the Atlantic except during the summer months of the year, in consequence of which it is very desirable that this great work of the Intercolonial Railway should be accomplished, and that this union of the provinces should take place. I presume it is a well understood fact that a people will always find some channel into which to direct their energies—that there will be a channel for their commerce—that there will be a channel for their produce. Now, if the Reciprocity treaty is abrogated, and if the bonded system is put an end to, it will be done long before the Intercolonial Railway can be established, and we must then remain suffering for a number of years until