

from New Brunswick by the bay of Fundy,—while New Brunswick is separated from Canada by the State of Maine, and a trackless forest of great extent. Mr. Fleming, in the report of his survey for an intercolonial railway made in 1824, gives us some insight into the nature of this country. He says:—

“A parallelogram, bounded on the South-East by a line drawn from Fredericton to Chatham, on the North-East by a line drawn from Chatham to Metis, on the South-West by a line drawn from Fredericton to River du Loup, and on the North-West by the settlements along the River St. Lawrence; about 90 miles in width, by 200 miles in length, and embracing nearly 18,000 square miles, is both unsettled and roadless.”

Here is a territory the size of the entire Province of Nova Scotia, so long as it remains unsettled must render a union between New Brunswick and Canada an impossibility. The Fin. Secy. in addressing the House read extracts from speeches of Hon. Mr. Howe, advocating the Intercolonial Railway as “a means to an end.” The end contemplated here, I presume, is the settlement of this territory, and the making, in such settlement, that connection between the two Provinces as might render, at some period, a political Union possible. And until that be first done I hold it is madness to enforce such a Union. Nor do I believe that with the boundary line of the two Provinces wiped out by settlements can the extraordinary anticipations of the Delegates be realized from a country shaped as are these Provinces. Turn to the map of the world and you will find every country, occupying a first class position, compact in shape, and just as the country departs from that it descends in the scale of nations. England has been styled “the tight little isle of the sea.” There is in her a compact territory, which affords that blending of interest which leads to a harmonious co-operation for the good of the whole. We have been frequently reminded since this question arose of the Heptarchy in England, and the great results of her Union. Union for her was a natural act, and so may it be said of England and Scotland. The boundary line is wiped out by the dense population, which flows back and forth, that the influence of the interest of each extends into and operates upon the other, forming a strong and enduring union. Ireland has not this territorial connection. The influence of her interests is bounded by the sea-shore, and naturally seeks a centre within her own territory. There is not the same interweaving of interests, and consequently the bond of union is acknowledged to be weaker than between England and Scotland. England grew in greatness and power by every union which combined territory and people and interests, having for each a natural affinity, but when she went beyond that she gained only elements of weakness. She crossed the Channel into France, and attempted to draw that people and country to her, but the more territory she acquired, the weaker she became, and eventually yielded to the inflexible law of nature that the drawings of all people are to their natural centre of interest. Look at France upon the map. No ragging arms or long jutting headlands, but all compact, and forming a country which claims and holds a first position among Empires. Go over the map of Europe, and just as you find countries departing from that

compact shape you find them descending in the scale of nations. But I may be referred to England's colonies scattered all over the globe and having no territorial connection with England, and be asked how she has held them without their being a source of weakness?—Simply by permitting them to manage all matters of internal policy as suited themselves. Attempting no action affecting the internal interest of a colony further than was compensated for by a protection of her external interests. By this wise and liberal policy she has seen her colonies grow and prosper in a remarkable degree. She departed from this policy when she proposed to tax the thirteen New England States, but the people regarded it as a violation of their chartered rights, and they severed the connection with the parent state. England saw the mistake Lord North had committed, and compelled him to repeal the act imposing a tax on colonists, and from that time to the present the policy pursued by England towards her colonies has been growing more enlightened and liberal.

But we have been told in this discussion, that England takes very strong ground on this question, and urges it for our acceptance, and so far have members of Government gone as to bring to their aid the name of Her Majesty the Queen. I have for some months seen that name used in the public newspapers in connection with this scheme, and felt it difficult to restrain my indignation at those who resorted to such unjust means to influence public opinion, but when the hon. Prov. Secretary took the same course in introducing his resolution, I listened to him with absolute disgust. Who taught those men to take such liberties with the name of our beloved Sovereign? It was Governor Eyre, of Jamaica, and his officials who headed proclamations “The Queen's Wish,” and who in their administration first exasperated the people and then butchered them. Let our officials beware how far they follow that unfortunate example. But, says the Prov. Secretary, it is mentioned in the speech at the opening of Parliament. Suppose it is, we all know that except in cases where ministers do not feel that it would interfere with their policy, the Sovereign does not alter a line or syllable of the opening speech. If there is one thing more than another for which we love and honor Queen Victoria, it is for her home virtues, and yet the ministry claim the right to regulate even her household—to say what maids of honour shall surround her person. Again we are told that we should accept this scheme from respect to the wishes of the British Government. Sir, I yield to no man in my respect for a government, which is a reflex of the opinions and sentiments of so liberty-loving a people as those of the British Isles, and when I study the policy established by that reflex of British ideas, I both admire and respect it. Commencing with the repeal of that law under which Lord North taxed the New England Colonies, and from which they rebelled, I trace down a policy growing year by year more liberal, progressing with the spirit of the age, and conferring upon us colonists all the privileges and freedom which the most ardent lover of self government can desire. And now should Mr. Card-