

our inter-township tradings, or our dealings between cities and country, adding exports and imports of course all round, and so proving that we have done more trade than all the rest of the world put together; unless, indeed, they were to count up the trade of the rest of the world by the same rule; and then to be sure they would find out that, after all, the rest of the world do more business, are more populous, richer, and stronger, than we. The question is not simply, What are our own resources? We must supplement it with a second—What are they comparatively? And especially, what are they as compared with those of the United States? And while we are asking this question, we may as well not take it for granted as a fact, that the larger our country the stronger we must be. Suppose we are to be four millions of people in a country as large as Europe or larger. I wish to Heaven we were four millions of people—with all the adjacent unexposed territory you will—but in a country smaller than England. Why, sir, New England alone has more population and resources, all told, than the Lower Provinces and Lower Canada together; and with her compactness and advantage of position, she could alone, presumably, beat both.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—New England stronger than the Lower Provinces and the two Canadas?

MR. DUNKIN—I did not say that; I said stronger than Lower Canada and the Lower Provinces.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is about the same in population, two and a half millions, while we have more shipping than they.

MR. DUNKIN—I fear that if we were to come into collision, a good deal of shipping might change hands. At any rate, at the best, we should have a pretty tight time of it. (Hear, hear.)

AN HON. MEMBER—Better put a bold face on it.

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, yes. "Brag is a good dog, but Holdfast is a better." Then, there is the State of New York, which would certainly be more than a match for Upper Canada—and New York is but one of several states conterminous with Upper Canada. Who in his senses, sir, thinks of these provinces as able, of themselves, to hold their own against New England, New York and the rest of the tier of states along our frontier? And yet we are talked to as if Confederation were about to make us the

third or fourth power, or maritime power in the world! But what I was saying more particularly was, that too much of territory, and above all too much of exposed frontier, does not increase our strength, but lessens it. Ours is the 'long thin line-of red,' which is not so well able to receive a charge as the solid square.

COL. HAULTAIN was understood to signify dissent to some of the propositions here advanced.

MR. DUNKIN—If the hon. member for Peterborough thinks that in a military point of view, the length and narrowness of our territory adds to our strength—if he thinks we are the stronger for our length of frontier, I would respectfully recommend him to attend one of our military schools (Laughter.) But seriously, sir, if we are to compare our resources with those of the United States, we shall find, as I have said, that theirs are unmistakably, and beyond count, greater.

COL. HAULTAIN—Than the British Empire?

MR. DUNKIN—That is not the comparison. We are continually hearing of what Confederation is to do for ourselves, how it is going to make us a great power in the world. It is going to do nothing of the kind. But again—and here is a third question that in this connection we have got to answer—how is the temper of the United States going to be affected, on the one hand, by the policy here urged on us, of what I may call hostile independent effort—effort made on our part, with the avowed object of setting ourselves up as a formidable power against them; or on the other hand, by a policy such as I have been urging, of unobtrusive development of our institutions in connection with the British Empire? In which of the two cases are they likely to be the more amiable, or, (which is perhaps more to the point), the less aggressive or practically unamiable, as our neighbors? Besides, there comes up still another question. What is to be the attitude of Great Britain under either of these two suppositions? As I have said, the question is, first, as to our own resources; next, as to the comparative resources of the United States; then, as to their attitude and temper towards us, upon one or other of these two suppositions; then, as to the attitude and temper of Great Britain, in reference to each of these suppositions; and lastly, as to the reaction (so to speak) upon ourselves, of these respective attitudes of the two countries in either case.