

for Roads and Bridges, he would not have been willing to have it. He says it is our only chance. I admit that if we are going to incur additional liabilities, there could be no better time. If it is done before going into Confederation, we can get the money at the rate of five per cent; and we know that if we give to assist Western Extension, whatever we give beyond our debt of seven million, the interest would come out of what we receive for our local purposes. I was rejoiced to find that my hon. friend recognized that the Province had money sufficient to provide for local purposes and to give this great work, also. I rejoiced to hear that he would assist the Government, and I could not help saying "hear, hear" to the proposition. I said that this satisfied my mind that he took a bright view of our future.

My hon. friend says that when I was advocating the construction of the Intercolonial Railway that I estimated that we would get something out of it more than working expenses. I doubt if he can find a speech of mine in which I said it would pay more than working expenses. I took the ground that it would pay working expenses, and my hon. friend from Westmorland took the ground that it would not. I thought that by connexion with Western Extension it would give some revenue. He says that I thought the European and North American line would pay three per cent in five years. I said if it paid three per cent in ten years, the indirect advantages would equal the amount of money expended. My hon. friend says I have been raking up papers to prove his inconsistency. I admit that the inconsistency of any member of the House does not affect the question. He says I am no true prophet—that my prophecies had not been realized; to prove this, he points to the Prohibitory Law and the Railway; but he admits that the Prohibitory Law had not a fair chance. With reference to the Railway, I admit that it cost more and the revenues from it were not as much as I expected. In regard to the Act which the House passed for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, it was adopted by the Legislature,—not through any influence which I exerted in the House, but because public sentiment was in favor of it, and the most important constituencies voted for it two to one. We now come in under a new arrangement, and if my hon. friend entertained the idea that it would not pay, and we would only have had £40,000 for our local purposes, he must now see the advantages of our position. We will have the Intercolonial Railway built; \$1,-

500,000 expended on Western Extension and the branches; we will have more money, making allowance for increased expenditure; we will have \$65,000 for our Roads and Bridges in 1871 than we had for the average of the last 7 years. My hon. friend must agree with me that we will be in a better position, even allowing for an increased population, than we would be if we remained out of the Union.

Mr. SMITH.—On this occasion I am determined to have the last word if I can get it. The Secretary has not answered my proposition at all—he has evaded it. I asked him what our revenue would be in 1881,—what we would pay into the revenues of Canada if our tariff was no higher than now? Every man must deal in speculation in speaking of the future; the Secretary has proclaimed his opinion, and told the advantages that would flow from Confederation. I think his memory is defective when he says I called him a false prophet in his predictions concerning the Railway and the Prohibitory Liquor Law. I have not even referred to the Liquor Law, but he must admit that he was mistaken in that; he must have thought the public mind was prepared for it, as all law is but the embodiment of the public mind of the country; but he was mistaken, and he was also mistaken in the earnings of the Railroad. I now ask the Secretary whether, when he made his calculations for 1881, he was not prepared to admit that twenty-five or thirty years hence the Intercolonial Railway might pay. I was surprised to hear the Secretary's statements regarding Western Extension, that, because I was willing to aid that road, I considered this scheme of Union would be a great advantage to the country. I said Western Extension was a work of great importance to the country, and I think the people in this country would be willing to withdraw some of the money from the Roads and Bridges in order to secure the construction of this work. I have not changed in the slightest degree my judgment regarding this Confederation. The Secretary says, "I am surprised that he was willing to assist the Government in carrying out that measure." In order to place me in a false position before the House and country, he says I have taken a gloomy view of the country, but now I have changed my mind and will support Western Extension. If there was anything in it, I doubt the propriety of it; this House will not be moved by any such inference drawn by the Secretary. I believe that Western Extension should go on, and the money dealt out from the Dominion of Canada should be applied to that work. I am

not going to weary the patience of this House any longer; therefore, I shall apologize for the time I have taken, because I felt that in justice to myself I should make these observations in reply to the Secretary.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—I expect you to have the last word, indeed I am quite sure you will. My hon. friend says, "the Secretary has not told us what we will pay into the revenues of Canada in 1881." I have stated that in my humble opinion we would not pay as much, or no more, into the revenues of Canada, according to population, than we have paid in the average of the last seven years. I stated distinctly that in Confederation, speaking for the present, future and all time to come, the inhabitants of New Brunswick would not pay more per head than the average of the last seven years, and after they arrive at a certain number the amount per head will be diminished. In illustration of this we will take the great population of the neighboring Republic. Before the war the people of that country—whether they paid it in the shape of revenue or imports upon the population—paid only \$1.90 a head, and they supported an army and navy, and had ambassadors in every port in the world. So it will be in this case, and while our population increases our expenditure will not increase in like ratio.

In regard to Western Extension my hon. friend says he is willing to take this money out of the money for Roads and Bridges. This is making a sacrifice we did not expect him to make. It impressed itself upon my mind when he was making his speech, that he had come to the conclusion that in the Union we were not going to be so penniless after all, and therefore he had volunteered to support that work. I thank him for it, as it is a work which will be of great benefit to the country.

Mr. SMITH.—Confusion worse confounded. I asked the Secretary for figures as to what our revenue would be in 1881, and he has dealt in platitudes. In adopting the average of the tariff for the past seven years he has not taken a fair basis, he has given the figures one way, but he has not done what I asked him to do, that is to tell us what our revenue would be in 1881 according to our present tariff.

The Secretary says he is obliged to me for my offering to support the Government in aiding Western Extension. He need not thank me, for he knows that I advocated it last year, as I considered it of infinitely more importance than any other Railway in the country.

In reference to the United States paying so much per head; it depends upon the prosperity of a country and how much they pay as a direct tax. If you apply the principle to the history of this Province you will find as the population