

emigration to the Province, I said you are too sanguine, and the result proves that I was right. As to what I have said to-day I am willing to appeal to any hon. member of the House in justification of myself and the language I employed. I did not contradict myself. I said if we had an increase of population the wants of the people would increase proportionally. I opposed the building of 3 1-2 twelfths of the Intercolonial Railway, and I made some calculation, that after paying the interest we would only have £40,000 for local purposes. I resisted the passage of the Bill. I said inasmuch as Canada repudiates the proposition to build the Road, what was the necessity for our legislating upon the subject. The Secretary knows that I said I was satisfied Canada would not accept the proposition. He told us that the very moment a change took place in the Government of Canada they would legislate in concurrence with us. I did not agree with him. Who was right, and who was wrong? They never did legislate upon the subject. The Secretary next tells us that the tariff of the United States will be reduced, and it will lessen the inducement for smuggling. I do not see how they can reduce their tariff, their policy being to pay off their national debt, and this illicit trade will go on and increase. While the country was convulsed with a great war, trade did not settle down, but when the war was over, and the people of the country settled down to an abnormal condition, then smuggling went on, and will still continue to go on, and the Secretary cannot stand here with any propriety and tell us the United States Government intend to reduce their tariff. I do not desire to take up the time of the House, but I have given my opinion of the question fairly and frankly. The Secretary's object seems to have been to place me in a false position, but he has failed entirely. Suppose I was the most inconsistent man in the world, what has that to do with this great and mighty question? It is not as I say, or as the Secretary says: it is vain for us to indulge in these speculations at all. The Secretary intends to go to Ottawa, and he feels it his duty to present a picture of our finances in 1881, but he looks at only one side of the question. He is like an advocate; he shows us how much better off we would be in Confederation than we would be out of it. Suppose my figures are true, and we have a revenue of two million, or two million and a quarter dollars in 1881, would we not be better off? The Secretary has told us about the Intercolonial Railway, but has he stated that the Road would not pay anything? I think he has induced the House to believe that as a commercial speculation the Intercolonial Railway

would yield some return. Let me ask him if he has taken into account that the Intercolonial Railway will not pay anything at all? Has he not charged the entire interest on the money to construct the Intercolonial Railway to the Province? Has he made any reduction at all? I think not. I do not hesitate to say that I do not believe it will yield much, if any, return at all. That was my opinion in 1863, and it is my opinion now. His calculations are not right if he has taken into account that the Road will pay. Suppose the Intercolonial Railway will pay three per cent, where would his calculations go then? Suppose his calculations were realized regarding the Railway which runs to St. John, does he give us any credit for the earnings on that Road? Suppose the Intercolonial Railway and the Branches were built, would they not be feeders to the St. John Road and increase the traffic? Has he given us credit for that? If he was right in telling us that the Intercolonial Railway was a good commercial speculation, and asking the Province to build 3 1-2 twelfths of it, he must be wrong now in not taking it into his calculations. If he has made any calculation, then I am wrong, and shall apologize to the Secretary. I am not going any further unless the Secretary replies, as he seems to want to have the last word; he had the last word the other day, and I suppose he wants to have it now, but if he speaks, I shall reply.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—I shall reply in a very few words. My hon. friend says he gave me the last word the other day, but I shall not have it now. It was the first time in my experience that he did give me the last word; I don't think such a thing ever occurred before. I was struck with the circumstance as so remarkable that I said, Really, he has allowed me the last word. It impressed itself upon my mind at the time, and I thought it a most wonderful victory over him that he allowed me to have it. He says he does not know why I should come down to the House and submit an estimate in reference to future years when I am to go to Ottawa. Suppose I do go to Ottawa: if I feel that his speeches are calculated to convey to the country what I believe to be erroneous impressions, I feel it my duty to make a statement of facts to go to the country, and this statement has not been contradicted. We cannot allow him to make statements which we believe to be erroneous, in regard to our liabilities and the means we have at our disposal. I stated I would be prepared with figures to show he was wrong, and that there would be ample means for the wants of the country. It is right that we should view our future position in

regard to this matter. I have shown by taking the expenditure of the last seven years into account that we would have in the next fifteen years much more per year than we had in the last seven. Did I say there would be more money than was necessary? I did not. Did I say population would not increase? I did not. Did I say the money would not be required and could not be expended on the roads? I did not. I desired to show the country and the House that if the population was double it would not double the expenses of the Government. That was the argument I used in 1863, when I was advocating the Act to provide for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and it is the argument I use now. I said the population would be increased, and we would have forty per cent. additional for our Roads, Bridges and Education. Could I be blamed for stating these facts? Was it wrong for us to state them here and show we were right? I felt it my duty, and availed myself of the privilege of having these facts go to the country.

Then, in reference to smuggling, he says, How do I know that the United States will decrease their tariff? I can only judge from what is said as to what is likely to be the policy of the Government of the United States. We know that during the war, and after the war was over, the Government put such duties on as were required to raise a revenue, and we judge as men judge in reference to such matters, that duties which reduce their debt two hundred million dollars a year will not long continue. The longer the violation of the revenue laws continue, the more stringent will be the measures taken to carry those laws into effect. Suppose a system of smuggling was going on across our borders, would our energies be more lax? Would we not take every means in our power to suppress that illicit trade? What we would do we may suppose others would do; therefore, we cannot expect the advantages derived from this source will continue. No one, I think, will undertake to say that such will be the case; therefore, we will not get as much revenue from this source if we remain out of Union as in times past.

I was rejoiced to hear my hon. friend's declaration, that he would give the Government his support to bring in a measure giving aid and assistance to carry on Western Extension. I rejoice for two reasons: first, that he considers the work worthy of his assistance; secondly, that he recognizes our ability to give it. If he had not felt in his heart that we could give it, without intrenching upon the money required