the best interests of the Island. It calls upon us to increase our tariff, and surrender our revenues. We are required to surrender our revenues for 80 cents per head of the population according to the census of 1861. We do not rebel in such terms. We have our interests or territorial revenues as the other Colonies. You have been told that we shall have free trade with all parts of the Confederacy. If so, we must raise whatever revenue we may require beyond the allowance accorded to us from the general Government, to which we contribute from our own resources. For myself and my constituents I shall oppose the scheme.

Mr McLENNAN.—I shall not detain you long, Mr. Speaker. It is but dull debating when all are on the same side. I shall not enter into the question of defence—that I shall leave for the hon and gallant Colonel, the member for Belfast; that of finance to his colleague, the Hon Col Secretary. I am conscious that anything which I may say can have no effect in promoting or retarding the adoption of the measure. If that were not the case, I would be inclined to enter more fully into the merits of this great question. Our action one way or the other can make little difference in view of the opinion expressed by the people of New Brunswick at the hustings, and in Nova Scotia through the press. The protraction of this debate is, in my opinion, but a waste of public time and money. I would prefer that the vote were taken on the resolutions of the Hon Col Secretary *seriatim*. That would show the country how far their representatives would go in this matter. I am not prepared to go the extreme length of those who declare they are opposed to Confederation on any terms. I am of the same opinion as the hon member for the city, Mr Davies, who believes that we are drifting into some kind of Union, that we should manfully grapple with the question, and, before any Union takes place, obtain the best terms possible. I believe the majority of the people of New Brunswick had not the subject fairly submitted to them in all its bearings when they voted against it; nor was it the bulk of the intelligence of that Province that decided it. For myself I would not assume the responsibility of voting in favor of Confederation without first submitting it to the people. I believe my constituents are satisfied that I am acting an independant part in the matter.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN then addressed the House at considerable length, but he having mislaid the extracts which he read, the Reporter is unable to give a connected report of his speech.

Mr. DUNCAN.—I have a few words to say on this great scheme which is to make this a wonderful country, give us a market of three millions of people, and cheap tea all the way from China. All those who have been in this Colony heretofore, it appears, are but children in trade; let them, however, only go up to Canada a few weeks and they will come down perfectly prepared to argue out any question on trade and finance. We are told that Confederation would promote manufactures in this Colony. Now, in my opinion, this Island can never become a manufacturing country, and I will give my reasons for so thinking. Supposing a person were to start a manufactory here, and another a similar establishment at Pictou, the former would have every market closed against him during the winter except this Island, and the latter would have all the country open to him the whole year round except this Colony in the winter season. The Pictou manufacturer could always send off his stock to market immediately while his Island rival would require to store his up for five or six months until the opening of navigation in the spring. The Islander, besides requiring an immense capital, the interest of which would diminish his profits, would frequently suffer from a fall of prices, causing a loss which might have been obviated by an open market. I do not think that any place which is closed in as we are for a part of the year has ever become a great manufacturing country. Then, again, the neighboring Provinces have other advantages over this Island for manufacturing. Canada has abundance of water power; so have Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and those latter Provinces possess coal likewise. But this Colony has no coal, nor has it iron, another advantage which its neighbors possess. This being the case, I think few manufactures can be carried on successfully here. The tanners may have a little to export for a few years; but the bark will soon be done, and then probably it will be better to export the hides and import leather. The interest therefore, as we cannot manufacture, is to obtain our goods in the cheapest market. Give other Provinces cannot compete with Britain in manufactures for many years; but if we only have free trade, we may be enabled to purchase within the Confederation, as cheaply as the Canadian European merchandise. This would prove a benefit to the Island in the following way: Suppose an article which could be purchased in Britain for £100 was to cost in Canada £115 what on account of the duty on the British article low as it might be, would induce parties to purchase that of Canadian manufacture; yet, supposing the loss of four-fifths of the Island trade should be one of the benefits arising out of the Confederation colonial free trade? By multiplying the wants of the people of this Colony, promoting trading, will Canadian goods, even after paying duty, be as cheap as British among themselves, all in a compact, with a tariff, under Confederation. But these are matters which time alone can tell, which can never be produced in these Provinces, and which, under the Canadian tariff, would not the people here much more than at present. Again, we are told that if we enter Confederation our fisheries will be developed. People, it is said, will come here from Canada to fish. This is a strange argument, when it is known that the Canadians already export enough fish to supply all British America. Herrings we have only to catch; these will have to be procured at the Magdalen Islands, a place which, though it has been basking for a long time under the sunshine of the Canadian Government, does not show many signs of progress. Everything which can be exported from this Island Canada produces, therefore no trade of any importance can spring up between this Colony and that Province. Notwithstanding this, I suppose we must contribute to build the Intercolonial Railway. The only article I see that we have got to send to Canada is oysters. Evidently, the Colonial Secretary has been very considerate in bringing in a Bill to encourage the planting of oysters, as it seems to me that we will have nothing else to send up to Canada on the Intercolonial Railway. Then, again, there is the matter of defence: it is stated that the police force which Canada has on the frontier this winter to prevent border raiding will cost a million of dollars. Were we now in the Union, our proportion of that sum, according to population, would be £768. But the general defences of Canada, according to Colonel Jervoie, are to cost $6,500,000. In Confederation this Island would have to bear its share of this expense, one which, in the present circumstances of our people, they are altogether unable to afford. Another objection which I have to the Quebec scheme is, that it would allow us only about £35,000 for local requirements, and this too a *fixed* sum, while our wants would yearly increase; perhaps the Canadians thought that under such a scheme they would *decrease*. (Laughter.) Our Revenue for last year was about £65,000, and deducting the sum to be received from this amount, shows that our loss under our own tariff would be £30,000. But besides this we would have to bear our proportion of building the Intercolonial railway, enlarging the canals, and furthering other public works, which would increase our taxation, and do us no good, but rather an injury by drawing away our people to labor upon them. Again, the "glory argument" is one which the advocates of Confederation never fail to bring forward. We are to become a great nation, but how this is to be effected the promoters of the scheme scarcely understand themselves. One of the advantages of it is, that our members of Parliament will go to live at Ottawa, and we will be left here to pay the chief justices in Canada. They need not deceive themselves, for none but those belonging to Canada will have much chance of attaining to such distinction. The Total Legislature, which the Quebec Report contemplates establishing, would be little better than a town council; we would have this building here merely to look at. As to the General Legislature, I consider the representation in it allowed to this Island unfair and unjust. I think the four Lower Provinces, at least, should have as many members in the Upper Branch as Canada. The five representatives allotted to us in the Lower House would not give this Island much influence there, but as our population will not increase so rapidly as that of Canada, there is a prospect, through the operation of one clause in the Report, that our five representatives would dwindle down to three. Taking all these points into consideration, therefore, it is clear to me that we have nothing to gain but much to lose by adopting the Quebec scheme.

Adjourned.

FRIDAY, March 31.

Debate on Union of Colonies resumed.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—Mr. Speaker, As leader of the Liberal party of this Island, I felt in a peculiar position while attending the Conferences on the question of Colonial Union now before the House. I felt that in acting as a Delegate I had not my own interest merely to look to, but that of a party who have acknowledged me as their leader for nearly eighteen years. And now, Sir, in addressing you I desire to make such explanations as may satisfy my constituents and the party with whom I am connected, in regard to the course which I have pursued on this question. Explanations of this nature may fairly be expected from me, since I am the only Delegate to this House opposed to the Confederation Scheme of the Quebec Conference—being one against four. It has been stated by former speakers that we all agreed to the scheme while at the Conference. I object to this statement. I admit that we were all unanimous in passing the first resolution of the Report; but it was only with the understanding that the details of the scheme were to be just to the several Provinces. Those who affirm that there was unanimity at the Conference ground their assertion, I believe, on several speeches delivered at evening meetings. But, Sir, I contend that an occasion graced with the presence of ladies—such being the case when I spoke at Ottawa—was not the proper place to attack any person, or take strong exception to any vote passed at the Conference. I did not do so then, but at the Conference a few days before, I said that if the grant for the purchase of the lands of this Colony was not conceded, they might as well strike Prince Edward Island out of the Report altogether. The public men of Canada knew my views on the subject; this is evidenced by a paragraph which lately appeared in the Toronto *Globe*, a paper under the control of the Hon. George Brown. The *Globe* says:—

"The anti-Confederation papers at Halifax are making much of the fact that two of the Prince Edward Island delegates who were at the Quebec Conference have, since their return home, declared against the Confederation scheme. These gentlemen are the Hon. E. Palmer, Attorney General in the present Government, and the Hon George Coles, a leading member of the Opposition. The *attitude assumed by these gentlemen is but what was to have been anticipated from expressions made by them while in Canada*, so that their hostility to Confederation is not any indication of the way in which the scheme has been received by the people of the Provinces. The gentlemen had their minds made up before their constituents had heard the details of the Quebec scheme at all."

Even my speech at Ottawa did not give satisfaction to the supporters of Confederation in Canada, for afterwards, the brother of the proprietor of the Toronto *Globe* came to me, at Toronto, and desired that I would not persevere in the sentiment to which I had given utterance, namely, that the scheme would require to be submitted to the people for their approval. All that I said on that occasion which can be construed as favorable to the series of resolutions passed at the Quebec Conference, is, that it was creditable to the delegates from so many Provinces that they could agree to draw up such a Report. I still hold to that opinion; and the British Government has also acknowledged that it was a creditable Report. If the people, I remarked, were satisfied with the scheme, I had nothing more to say on the subject. But that I was personally dissatisfied with the new Constitution is clear from the fact that I refused to sign it. Before I left Canada, the Secretary of the Conference came to me, supposing probably that I was opposed to the Report, and asked me if I would sign the document. I said no. He then answered that if I should agree to sign it he would send it down to Prince Edward Island. I said, "you need not trouble yourself." I may also mention that Hon. Mr. Gray of New Brunswick, in one of his speeches after his return from Canada, stated that all the delegates at the Conference had signed the Report, and would be bound in honor to support it. This, I thought, was going too far, so I wrote a letter to the newspapers here contradicting the statement, and showing that it was not correct at least as regarded myself. And, Sir, we have been informed during this debate that two others of the delegates from this Island have not signed the document. The absence of their signatures, however, is a matter of little consequence, as they have agreed to the Report, one of them having broadly declared that its principles are just and liberal to Prince Edward Island. It was understood that the proceedings at the Conference should be secret; but they have been alluded to by delegates at other places, therefore there can be very little impropriety in referring to them in this discussion. I may also mention here that when the proposition in favor of Confederation was first made at the Charlottetown Conference, I objected to it, but stood alone in my opposition. I was then allowed to state the fact to my constituents. I make these explanations, for it may be necessary in the course of my remarks to refer to the proceedings at the Conference in self vindication. Only two of us, I believe, who were delegates to Quebec, object to the terms of the Report. For this opposition we have been charged as being almost traitors. Indeed it has been affirmed that Anti-unionists are guilty of combining with Americans against British interests. Hear what the Hon. D'Arcy McGee said in the Canadian Legislature on this subject. During the course of his speech on the Confederation question, in replying to some interruption from the opposition benches, he remarked:—

"The hon member for North Hastings Mr. (T.C. Wallbridge) seemed to repudiate the idea that American influence had anything to do with the result of the New Brunswick elections. He had to tell that hon. gentleman that one of these successful candidates was agent for the American line of steamers, the International line, which did all the carrying trade to New Brunswick, and there was not a pound of the stock of that Company held in New Brunswick. (Hear, hear.) *It was in point of fact a fight—a fair stand-up fight of Yankee interests on the one side and British interests on the other; and those* who were rejoicing over Mr Tilley's defeat were in reality rejoicing over the defeat of British interests. It was a contest between prejudice and patriotism; between ignorance and intelligence, between Yankee influence and the broad national principles of British North American policy. (Hear, hear.) Those who rejoiced over this state of things might congratulate themselves if they chose; but it was for the House to stand by the true public opinion of the country. It was for us to show an example of firmness and good faith in carrying out this scheme. *It was for us to show the Empire that we were determined to adhere to our original resolution and that we were not people who would forget our determination in a few days or a few weeks.*" (Cheers.)

I deny these charges. I believe that the Anti-unionists are just as loyal as any Unionist can be. I feel that my loyalty is equally as sincere as that of those who so zealously advocate the Quebec scheme, for I have yet to learn that Great Britain has said we must go into