

large amount of valuable shipping engaged in the inland trade, and a vast amount of freight is carried between the countries; and the only just plan is to state separately that which is sea-going shipping and that which is inland. Acting on this plan, I find that in 1863, the tonnage between Canada and foreign ports was as follows:—

	Inwards.	Outwards.	Total.
Canada.....	1,041,309	1,091,895	2,133,204
Nova Scotia.....	712,939	719,915	1,432,854
New Brunswick	659,258	727,727	1,386,985
P. E. Island, 1862.....	69,080	81,208	150,288
Newfoundland.....	156,578	148,610	305,188
	<u>2,639,164</u>	<u>2,769,355</u>	<u>5,408,519</u>
Inland Navigation.			
Canada.....	3,538,701	3,368,432	6,907,133
Total tons.....	<u>6,177,865</u>	<u>6,137,787</u>	<u>12,315,652</u>

Now, sir, the United States are in the same position as we are in respect to this inland traffic, and they include it in their returns as is done here. And what, sir, do you think is the difference between their tonnage and ours? Why ours is over twelve millions and theirs is but sixteen millions. There are not four millions of tons of difference between the two. (Hear, hear.) And let it be recollected that the United States have had seventy years start of us. As regards France, the whole amount of shipping that entered and left the ports of that great country in one year was but 8,456,734 tons—four millions of tons less than that of the British American Provinces. May we not then, when this union is accomplished, fairly claim to be the third maritime state of the world; and may we not even entertain the hope that, at some future day, a still higher position is not beyond our reach, when the days of puberty have been passed and the strength of manhood has been reached? I ask honorable gentlemen, in looking at these figures, to consider what the effect must be when they are set down thus collectively, side by side, in official commercial returns, in comparison with the commerce of all the great maritime states? Will it not strengthen our position abroad?—will it not give us a degree of influence and importance to have it known that British America wields so large a share of the world's commerce?—And if honorable gentlemen will still further consider the deep importance to Canada, in her inland position, of exercising her just influence in the control of so valuable a maritime interest, I think they will come to the conclusion that all the objections urged against this union are, in the balance of its advantages, utterly contemptible.

(Cheers.) But, in the fourth place, Mr. SPEAKER, I go for a union of the provinces, because it will give a new start to immigration into our country. It will bring us out anew prominently before the world—it will turn earnest attention to our resources, and bring to our shores a stream of immigration greater, and of a better class, than we ever had before. I was in England when the first public announcement of this scheme was made, and witnessed, with pleasure, the marked impression it produced. You could not go abroad, you could not enter into any company, in any class of society, where Canada or the British American Provinces were mentioned, but you heard this union movement spoken of almost with enthusiasm. And I say it is desirable that this scheme should not be delayed, but be carried through promptly and vigorously. I hesitate not to say that it should be accompanied with a vigorous effort to give a new impetus to our industrial enterprises, to open up fresh lands for settlement, and to cheapen the transport of our produce to the sea-board. With the consummation of this union, I trust we will have a new immigration and a new land settlement policy—that we will ascertain every lot of land we actually own, so that a printed list may be placed in the hands of every immigrant—that the petty price we have been heretofore exacting will no longer be exacted, but that to actual settlers, who come among us to hew out for themselves and their children homes in the forest, no burthen or condition will be demanded, beyond resident occupation for a certain number of years, and a fixed amount of improvement on the land.—

HON. MR. HOLTON—Unfortunately for your argument, the lands will be in the hands of the local governments.

HON. MR. BROWN—So much the better. My honorable friend can manage his public lands in Lower Canada as he likes, and we will manage ours. And, speaking for the western section, I am bound to say there are very few shrewd men in Upper Canada who do not feel that far more public benefit is to be gained from the industry of a hardy actual settler upon 100 acres of land given to him free, than the trumpery \$150 that can be squeezed out of him as its price, the payment of which keeps him in trouble perhaps for years, and retards the progress of the country. On this question of immigration turns, in my opinion, the whole future success of this great scheme which we are now discussing. Why, sir, there is hardly a political or financial or social problem suggested by this union that