

people believe the story they told, and the result was that every one of them were rejected at the elections. I do not intend to go further into the subject. I simply make these remarks as an opening, as it will be taken up and treated on by able men than myself.

Mr. McMILLAN.—The hon. mover of these resolutions should expound his views, and lay before the House the reasons for the position he takes, so that hon. members who are opposed to him may have an opportunity of replying to his remarks.

Mr. CUDDEP.—If this subject were being debated in the whole House with the Speaker in the chair, this would be the right way to proceed, but in Committee every hon. member should be at liberty to speak freely. I have no objection to expound the reasons why I brought in this resolution, but I am weary of talking on this Scheme, for I have had so much of it to do for the last six months. I find that the Duke of Newcastle in a despatch to Earl Mulgrave, dated the 6th July, 1862, says as to the authority of the delegates that "it should emanate in the first instance from the Province, and should be concurred in by all of them which it would affect." Here it is directly laid down that the people should take the lead in any measure of this kind; yet we know that the delegates not only conferred on the subject of Union, but adopted a Scheme of which the people knew nothing. The resolution passed by this House in 1861 was on a matter of the Union of the three Lower Provinces, and had no reference whatever to a Union with Canada. I might go into the Scheme and show that it carried out it would have proved most disastrous to the interests of this Province, but that has been so well ventilated that it is not necessary, and the country has decided on it. But I want another delegation appointed that we may put ourselves right before the British Government, and that they may confer on all points that tend to the welfare of this Province. If it is wanted to put the resolution down, the House can do it, but I think it is necessary that the question should be taken up and hon. members can oppose it by any arguments they choose to bring.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN.—The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Cuddepp) has avoided touching upon the three points of his resolution, namely that Confederation would prove disastrous to this country, politically, financially, and commercially. He has given no reasons for the ground he has taken in the resolution. He says the country has pronounced against it, and the vote of this House will doubtless decide against it; then I would ask, why put the country to the expense of sending gentlemen home merely to tell England the wishes of the people of this Province? These were ascertained by the late elections, and are well known in England, without sending home a special delegation to tell them of it. The hon. mover has declined to sustain the three positions he assumes.

Hon. Mr. SMITH.—You can disprove them.

Mr. McMILLAN.—Yes, that is a very logical idea. The hon. President of the Council calls on me to prove a negative. I will, however, answer a few of the grounds taken. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) says with regard to this Union, "there is no strength in it." No strength in it! Union is not strength then,—a proposition contrary to what I have always heard. He says, "there

would be rebellion in the country if the Scheme had been carried." This I consider to be the highest compliment which could possibly be paid to the Confederates. He says in effect that if there had been a majority for the Scheme, the minority would have rebelled. The friends of Confederation did not succeed, they were found to be in a minority, and yet they proved to be as loyal as those who succeeded in crushing the measure by a large majority. I say this is a high compliment to pay to those who were charged with wishing to dissolve the ties that bind us to the glorious mother country. He says, "the elections were hurried on, and that we relied on the ignorance of the people to carry it through." This is an argument that to my mind will cut both ways. I believe that a great many voted against Confederation because they failed to understand the benefits that would follow from it; but the anti-Confederate leaders threw up that great bug-bear taxation.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN.—The hon. member says hear, hear, but he knows such was the case, and he used this very argument. On the same ground all the great Schemes that ever came up, have been attacked, but in the end the people have seen their mistake, as I have no doubt they yet will on this question. Then the hon. member says we were "going to be swamped, only fifteen members from New Brunswick and so many from Canada." He seems to forget what matters were to come before the General Government to be discussed.

What is it that makes dissension and dissension; is it not the matters that are of a local character? But there the question of tariffs and general trade could have caused no such dissension. And then supposing difficulties did arise what would affect us would in a like manner affect Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, and Lower Canada, and these together would wield a greater influence than could be brought to bear against them. See how it has been in Canada, although divisions have taken place there, the parties were so equal that a few members were always able to sustain or overthrow a Government. And how shall it be said that Upper Canada, with her eighty-two members will swamp us, when we are backed by 112 on all discussions of a general character which alone can be brought up. And then it has been said that Upper Canada is increasing very rapidly in population. Well, will they not have to contribute in proportion to their population, and then the less *per capita* shall we have to pay. These are all local views of the matter, but in a question of this kind, we should rise above such petty, narrow views, and look at the advantages that would accrue from our being a large, united and free people. Next the hon. member for Victoria said that there was no certainty or guarantee whatever that the Railway would be built. But this was provided for in the Scheme, and sanctioned by the Imperial Government. He then said that Canada would go on with canals and public works, and we should have to pay for them. I am not prepared to endorse such a proposition, for with a population ten times that of ours, I do not think it at all likely they will be willing to tax themselves \$10 for the purpose of getting \$1 from us. Then as to the Railway through our Province; it would go through the entire length, and of the \$16,000,000—the entire cost—some \$9,000,000 would be spent in this Province. The Railway would run some 220 miles,

opening up and increasing the value of our Crown Lands at least four fold for all time to come for our own particular benefit. Another point made is that our population would not increase. This is certainly new to me; what is it that brings people to a country, is it not that trade is flourishing? And would it not give an impetus to trade to have the barriers that exist in other countries broken down? And it would become a matter of indifference whether goods were made in Montreal, or Toronto or St. John, as the maxim would be to "buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest." The hon. member for York (Mr. Needham) says we were to be sold for \$201,000. He evidently has forgotten that the General Government would have assumed a large amount of our liabilities. There was

Interest on our assumed debts	\$407,000
Our share I.C. Railroad on population,	52,000
Our proportion of Militia,	70,000
Cost and Protection of the Revenue,	41,000
Salary of Judges,	28,000
Post Office deficiency,	25,000
Geological survey,	5,600
Master of Rolls,	3,200
Indians,	1,800
Unforeseen expenses,	2,000
Subsidy at 80 cents,	201,600
Our share of steam navigation,	20,000
Subsidy extra for ten years,	63,000
Whilst we put in our average revenue for three years,	785,589
Leaving	\$139,411

which we get over and above the Railroad, Free Trade and all the advantages to arise from them.

Now supposing Western Extension were built according to our Facility Bill, and the Intercolonial according to the law now on our Statute Book, with the Civil List and all the expenses of the local Government, we should require a revenue of \$1,138,340. Whilst it is only \$785,589. We should therefore get out of the Confederacy according to our own law \$352,751 more than we contribute. How then can it be said that we were to be sold for \$201,000? Another objection raised by the hon. member for York (Mr. Needham) and that is that we should be bound by any arrangement Canada should choose to enter into; but this same argument was used in Canada with regard to New Brunswick. The 67th Section of the Scheme however is general in the application. I have asked the hon. mover to substantiate the three positions he assumes, but he has declined to do so. I have attempted to show that in a financial point of view we should have been placed in a better position, and I cannot understand how a political body such as we should be would injure the little Province of New Brunswick. Is it imagined that New Brunswick, with her House of forty members, eclipses in importance the 194 members of a united Confederacy? Would not the larger body be regarded as of more importance, and wield a greater influence, and be of more weight in the eyes of the Mother Country and the Imperial Parliament than we are now? Politically we should be placed in a far better position, and commercially we should also be benefited. Would it injure us that all the imaginary lines and Custom House