

habit of importing all their castings, boots and shoes, soap and candles, and various other articles from Canada, paying from seven and a half to twelve per cent., besides all other charges. And some still continue to import them and put them in our stores cheaper than they can be produced in New Brunswick; and, until a year or two ago, I have seen stoves, boots, shoes, and various other articles of that kind, imported from Canada, paying seven and a half per cent., and still come cheaper than the manufactures of New Brunswick. I have bought stoves from the foundries of New Brunswick which were imported from Canada, and sold to me cheaper than they could produce them themselves. A large trader in Miramichi showed me, within nine months, a quantity of boots and shoes, which he had imported, and asked me what I thought they cost him. I said, about fifteen shillings. He said, I have paid all the expenses up to this time, and they cost me about \$2.50 a pair. This was a gentleman who had advocated Confederation. I asked him what they would cost in New Brunswick. He said \$3.00. I asked him how our manufactures in New Brunswick would stand after that seven and a half per cent. duty is taken off. He said that was none of his business. I might argue this matter at some length, but I will not take up the time. I shall merely say that I object to the Quebec Scheme in various ways. It will entail an extra expense upon the union of \$2,000,000 a year. That is a larger amount than we can afford to pay. Another objection is representation by population. If we are joined by Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland, our representatives will only be forty out of one hundred and ninety-four, but it is doubtful whether we will be joined by them. Another objection to the scheme is the eighty cents per head, which I consider entirely too small, and too much power is given to the Parliament at Ottawa. They have the power of vetoing almost everything that is done by the local Governments. That is a power I do not wish to see taken from us.

I am a New Brunswicker by adoption, for I have lived here since the happy days of childhood, and all I hold dearest on earth live in New Brunswick. Whatever I possess of worldly goods I have made in this Province. Therefore, it has my best wishes for its prosperity, and my best services are due and shall be devoted to her services, but notwithstanding all this I am a Briton by birth, and I am proud—as I trust, every member on the floors of this House is—to call myself a British subject. It is from a Briton we look for protection and aid in our time of need. From Britain we have received whatever aid was necessary for us, and it is pretty certain that before long we will have to look to Britain again to protect our fisheries. It, therefore, becomes our interest as well as our duty to meet the wishes of the British Government, as far as is consistent with our own interests. She has expressed a wish for a union of these Provinces. There may be a great difficulty in connecting a scheme of union, but I should like to see ourselves put in a proper light in the eyes of Britain. I should like to be able to say to the British Government: The Government of New Brunswick have said they do not want to go into confederation. The people have said so at the last election, an

election called for the purpose of giving expression of opinion on that subject. We do not want the Quebec Scheme, but the loyal people of New Brunswick, anxious to meet the wishes of the mother country in order to show their attachment, a scheme has been prepared which we now beg to submit, and which will show to the people of Britain that we are a loyal people. That is the position in which I should like to see us; and although I am still strongly opposed to Confederation and the Quebec Scheme, still if such a scheme could be concocted I would like to see it gone into. The first step would be to depute an equal number of Confederates and Anti-Confederates from each Province to consider a scheme, which is to be submitted to the Legislatures of the different Provinces, but before a decision is given it should go back to the people, and I have no doubt but it would meet the wishes of a large majority of the people of the County of Kent, who are now strongly opposed to the Quebec Scheme. Let me not be misunderstood. I do not want to see a scheme like the Quebec Scheme put upon the people of New Brunswick. I do not want to see a scheme that will bind us for all time to come to Canada, and place us in a condition of dependence upon her. But a scheme that will protect the best interests of the people of New Brunswick, a country in which I have lived for the past forty-six years, and the country in which I hope to die.

MR. GILBERT.—My hon. friend, who has just taken the seat, and myself were elected to oppose a union of the British North American Colonies. We may attempt to shelter ourselves in vain, by telling the House we were pledged to oppose the Quebec Scheme and that we can go for union in the abstract, or agree to be united politically with our sister Provinces upon any terms. I tell my hon. friend that I do not think fifty of his constituents knew much about the Quebec Scheme when they voted for him. They did so because he was opposed to union. They were not prepared to give up the Constitution of this Province, or go into any political union with Canada, without having more time than two or three weeks to consider upon it. I think he would be derelict in his duty to his constituents, as I would be to mine, to vote for any kind of union, unless we had further authority from the people; therefore, I hope my hon. friend, before we get through with this debate, will look upon this question in the same light in which I look upon it, and that he will come to the conclusion that he will not be violating his pledges to his constituents of he should vote for this amendment.

As I have the honor of representing one of the most important constituencies in the Province, who contribute largely to the revenues of the country, and are deeply interested in the proper administration of the Government of the country, I should neglect my duty if I should give a silent vote upon this most important question, although it would be more consistent with my feelings to do so, as two of my colleagues are in the Government. Sir, I regret that the affairs of this country have been so conducted that it has become necessary to move a vote of want of confidence against their administration, after their having such an overwhelming majority only nine months ago. The hon. member from the County of Kings (Mr. Scovil) thought proper

to refer to me, in the course of his speech. I did not think proper to interrupt him while speaking, because I knew from experience—we having been school-boys together—that he would forget his lessons if he was interrupted. As I had taken no part in the debate, I do not know why he referred to me, and said I had arrived at a conclusion, not through my own judgment, but through the judgment of others. He misunderstands the person he deals with, for my hon. friend should know that this is not my character. He says it is the nature of the soil of King's County to produce fruit after its own kind, the same which was planted; that potatoes in that County do not produce pumpkins. Sir, that was the case when Mr. Freeze and the two McLeods were the independent and intelligent representatives from that County. In those days there was nothing servile in the members from Kings, for they would not bow the knee nor listen to the winning voice of any man; but those men having gone to their long homes, the feelings of that County have changed in these latter days, and it is now a fact that potatoes in that County will grow pumpkins, and it may be that the true production of the soil of King's County is not present in this House, which the people of King's have sent for exhibition, and we may come to the conclusion from what we see here, that pumpkins are to be grown from potatoes in that County, the hon. member's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. The Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works said he had never referred to the hon. mover of the amendment, except when he was present, and on no occasion had he treated him as he had been by him treated; but in that same speech he referred to Mr. Boyd, a merchant of St. John, a gentleman of high standing, who was not in the House to defend himself. This gentleman he called "an inflated bladder." Was he not sheltering himself behind the privileges of this House to commit a cowardly act, to bring in the name of a private individual, voluntarily, in this manner? Another hon. gentleman has taken occasion to refer to a gentleman who has been the leader of the late Government, and has enjoyed the confidence of the constituency of St. John for many years, and who has as much interest in the welfare of the Province as those who boast so much of their disinterestedness in taking office. Has the time arrived in this country when a man is to be attacked because he thinks proper to come within the walls of this House to listen to this debate? It is acting unfairly to do so, when that gentleman has no place on the floors of this House, and in a position to defend himself, and such a course is resorted to to distract the attention of hon. members from the true issue before the House. It was for the same reason that my hon. colleague occupied fifteen minutes in trying to show that my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) was wrong in giving notice of one form of amendment and submitting another. This had nothing to do with the question. The question before the House was, whether the general conduct of the Government was such that they should enjoy the confidence of the House? I was one of those who advised him to make the alteration, because I thought the language used in the amendment which he first proposed to move, and which he gave notice of, might be construed to be an undue reflection upon the neighboring