

priety of his applying them on a broader field, and forthwith the hon. member comes down here and informs the house that an attack had been made on his virgin purity, but that he had manfully resisted the assailant. Now he tells us, establish this, and you will have played in the Confederation, by the Government of the United States, the same game that they have been playing in Mexico. Now, sir, does it not occur to him that, if the United States have a game of this kind to play, they could not take a hand at any time more effectively than at this moment? Is it their game to keep us isolated and apart—to foment jealousies between the different colonies—to separate them by hostile tariffs—to induce the public men of one colony to slander and abuse those of another—to suggest the advantages of American connection, and to foretell to the people of this country that in ten years they will have a President and be under the Stars and Stripes. I say that if the American Government have money to spend for the purpose to which the hon. member refers, and have the sagacity for which he gives them credit, is it too much to suppose that they may take a deep interest in what is going on at this moment? The hon. member undertakes to say that Confederation will weaken us. Is that the doctrine proclaimed by his allies in the United States? Mr. Banks has lately taken a great interest in our affairs; he has introduced into Congress a bill to provide for our admission into the United States. The advantages which this bill offers us are spoken of in very favorable terms by the representatives in England of the Anti-Confederates. Mr. Banks has studied the question from his own point of view. Let us see what he thinks of Confederation. In speaking to a resolution recently introduced by him into Congress, he said:—

“A Bill had recently come before the House of Lords in England contemplating the establishment of an empire in the British North American Provinces, which might hereafter surpass in power that of England herself, or might equal that of the United States, or, as has been well said by its mover, might be second only to that of Russia. The Legislature of Maine, more interested in the movement than any other State, had, through its Committee on Federal Relations, made a report adverse to that project which report he would ask to have read to the House. The stage into which that bill had passed in the House of Lords was the most important of any of the stages through which bills pass as all its fundamental principles were in consideration. He did not doubt that the people of this country would look with intense solicitude upon the progress of this great movement in the British Provinces, which contemplated the establishment of an empire, formed on monarchical principles, so framed as to control public opinion, and which could not fail to have in the future a material if not a controlling influence and power over the affairs of the American Continent.”

Can anybody misunderstand this? Mr. Banks has the sagacity to perceive that Confederation is to confirm and establish our position on this continent. He sees that the true policy of the United States—as indicated by the report of the Maine Committee on Federal Relations—is to do just what the hon. member for Halifax is doing; and nobody will deplore the hon. gentleman's failure more than those of his American allies who have the sagacity to see how much his success would promote the interests and the policy of the United States.

Is there any gentleman in this House that supposes Mr. Banks would assume this position—would protest against Confederation—would ask his government to interfere impertinently in matters with which they have nothing to do—if he believed, as the member for Halifax asks this House to believe, that in ten years Confederation will place us under the American flag. If Mr. Banks thought this, instead of protesting against Confederation, he would do all he could to encourage it—instead of aiding the hon. member in his efforts at isolation he would cheer on us who take the opposite view as his friends and allies.

But the hon. member has called the attention of the house to the pecuniary disadvantages under which we shall enter the Union. He says that since 1863 the revenue of Nova Scotia has increased \$351,822 a year, and still all we get back under the arrangements recently agreed to in London in addition to that which was secured for us by the Quebec scheme is \$60,000 a year. The financial arguments addressed to this house can hardly impose upon the members, and are probably not intended to have that effect.

I have not time this morning to verify the hon. gentleman's figures as to the increase of the revenue of Nova Scotia. I will assume that he is correct. But if Nova Scotia has gone ahead, have the other Provinces stood still? In 1863 the revenue of Canada was \$9,760,316. In 1866 it was \$12,432,748, so that while our revenue has increased by \$351,822, that of Canada has increased by \$2,662,432.

Even our weaker sister, New Brunswick, has increased in equal proportion. Her revenue in 1863 was.....\$0,899,991
While in 1866 it was.....1,212,021

Which shows an increase of.....\$312,030
So that great as has been the increase of our Province, and we may well be proud of the evidence it affords of our country's prosperity, the increase of Canada and New Brunswick has been quite equal to our own.

But not only do their revenues bear to ours a fair proportionate increase, but both Canada and New Brunswick shew a larger comparative surplus. There remains to the credit of Nova Scotia, after meeting the expenditure of the year, a surplus of \$60,000, while that of New Brunswick is \$122,000, a quantity twice as much, and that of Canada, after paying the extraordinary disbursements connected with the Fenian invasion, is \$710,000, or over ten times that of Nova Scotia.

But what becomes of our \$351,000? Why, it goes into the same chest with the 2½ millions of Canada—with the one third of a million of New Brunswick. It goes to make a common purse for common objects, and we have the same right to our fair share of that contribution after it goes in as we should have had if it had never gone there.

Not only shall we have a right, but we shall be in a position to assert that right. Nothing