

these expenses. The Government of Canada is driven to the last extremity to get money she borrowed last year \$2,000,000 and paid seven per cent. for it. We have never paid over six per cent. except the discount upon our debentures. The Secretary has failed to show that our finances would be improved by a Union with Canada, his financial statement in regard to this is utterly fallacious. He gives Canada the credit of providing for the deficiency in the Post Office Department. According to Mr. Odell's report the office would be self-sustaining by the addition of a small tax upon newspapers, and this will be put upon them after we go into Union. He says we gain by not having to pay so large a proportion for the construction of the Inter-Colonial Railway, as we would have to do by a former agreement. I opposed that law, which has now expired, giving $\frac{3}{4}$ twelfths of the money required for the construction of the Inter-Colonial Railway, because I considered that Nova Scotia in that adjustment had the advantage of us, for she is a richer country, has a larger population, and there would be the terminus of the road. I am not opposed to Railroads, but I am opposed to recklessly running a country in debt. The Provincial Secretary is not prudent and cautious enough, he was willing to do it without any hesitation at all. I said the benefits to be derived from the construction of that road would not be equivalent to the expenditure, and I resigned my seat as Attorney General in consequence. When the Provincial Secretary accuses me of not bringing forward great measures, I want him to point out what great measure he has brought forward that has not ended in smoke, like the Inter-Colonial Railway and the Prohibitory Liquor Law. He says my talents are for destruction and not for construction. Is this to be applied to me because I pointed out the objections to this scheme that suggested themselves to my mind and opposed the Inter-Colonial Railway? I think it is wrong to make these charges. He says that when they prepared that scheme he saw it would be such an advantage to New Brunswick, that he thought the people would embrace it at once. This proves that his judgment is not reliable. He told us after his return from Canada that the scheme would not be submitted to the people until it had been first debated on the floors of the House. He told the people of Carleton that the matter would be submitted to the House.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—I stated there, as I did at the Institute in St. John, that the measure would not be submitted to the

Legislature until an election had taken place.

Mr. SMITH—Will you deny the statement which appeared in the *Morning News* that you had stated to the people of Carleton that before a dissolution took place the matter would be submitted to the House of Assembly and discussed?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—The report was not a correct one. My statement was in answer to a question asked by Mr. Macbrane.

Mr. SMITH—That proves how difficult it is to understand his statements. I think he wanted to evade Mr. Macbrane. Will the Secretary undertake to state distinctly that the Government did not come to a decision not to have a dissolution?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—I stated so.

Mr. SMITH—Why then did the election take place in Northumberland?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—I stated that in the first place we thought we would meet the House, and at that time we issued the writ for that election, but subsequently we changed our policy.

Mr. SMITH—That shows their inconsistency; they determined first to meet the House, and then immediately afterwards to dissolve it. It was an act of tyranny for them to dissolve the House in mid-winter upon a question of such importance to the country. If the day appointed for holding the elections had been stormy, men who had to travel thirty or forty miles would not have been able to have got to the polls. Vast numbers of the electors were engaged in lumbering operations at that season of the year, and could not vote at all. The people should have had time to give a calm consideration to such a great question. The Government dissolved the House because they expected to carry the elections, but they were disappointed. Short as the time was for the people to consider the scheme, they would not submit it to them, because official etiquette forbade its being published until it was submitted to the eye of the Queen, and we first received it from Prince Edward Island. It has been said that the Queen and British Government were in favor of this scheme, and this was given as a reason why we should adopt it. They have rung changes upon it, that Her Majesty the Queen wanted the consummation of this scheme of Union. This was protesting the Queen's name. We know that in the House of Commons no man dare make use of the Queen's name, for it is a breach of Parliamentary rule. The Queen can do no wrong, and her name can be identified with no party. She is ready to award the palm to those who win the victory. The Queen recommended the "Reform Bill," but in

the discussion upon that bill it was not used as an argument that the Queen wanted it passed. Although the spoke of it she only spoke the will of her ministry. Suppose the Queen did not want Confederation; with all her virtues she is but a woman, and what value would her judgment be regarding a country she never saw. What do the British Ministry know about this country? If they had the same means of knowledge that we have concerning it I would value their judgment. There is not a man in the British Ministry that has ever been in this country, and the people of England know little about it. They look upon it as a political matter, for they see the necessities of Canada, and they know that some scheme must be devised or that country would be in the throes of rebellion. When we are asked to ignore our own judgment because the Ministry of England, who are men of great intellect, learning and erudition, are in favor of it I say their judgment in this matter is no better than ours. The people of England, we are told, want it too. We asked Mr. Cardwell if it was not because they assumed that the taxation upon them would cease for this portion of the Empire. Mr. Cardwell said this was true, but he was not prepared to admit that this was the only reason why they wanted it, but he acknowledged it to be one of the leading reasons, and he acknowledged the force of many of the objections. The people all seemed to think that it was to be a Legislative Union, and when it was explained to them that there were to be six separate Parliaments they seemed to be astonished, and said it was objectionable and wrong. The scheme has been prepared with reference to the difficulties of Canada which have existed for the last fifteen years in regard to representation by population. In 1841 an Act of Union was passed to unite the two Canadas under one Government, each to have an equal number of representatives. Lower Canada had then three or four hundred thousand population more than Upper Canada. If the principle of representation by population is right now it was right then. Mr. George Brown is the person who has been advocating this principle, and it has been the apple of discord between the two Canadas. Upper Canada has increased largely in population and wishes an increased number of representatives, and this difficulty has been increasing until the whole machinery of Government has come to a dead lock. The scheme is deficient in not providing some tribunal to appeal to in the event of a conflict between the General Government and the Local Legislature. The Prov. Sec. seems to think that the General Govern-