

prosperity that such a state of things would produce, who can estimate the position we would occupy in a few years time should this Union be accomplished?

Let us look now at the United States before the commencement of this war, and see if the condition of affairs there does not present a powerful argument for Union. A population of three millions in 1773 grew into thirty millions by 1860. They presented a spectacle of progress in wealth, in arts, in civilization, in commercial prosperity, which amazed the people of Europe. Now it may be asked what produced the rapid and unprecedented advancement of this country? What produced such effects within the compass of a single life? It was, no doubt, owing to various causes. Fertility of soil, variety of climate, the education of the masses of the people, each and every one of these causes had its effect. But they had had the same soil, the same climate, and the same means of education for some 80 years before 1780, and yet the population had only reached three millions. What, then, was the main cause of all this? It was, that before 1780 they were divided, just as these Colonies are now. They had separate governments, separate tariffs, with hostile armies of Customs officers on their borders,—they had separate currencies, and were divided by sectional differences just as much as we are now. But the moment they were united under one government—the moment that the armies of officials which hampered and restricted trade in every State were struck off—the moment that the system was adopted by which an article entering the Union at one port could pass free to any other—from that moment a stimulus was given to trade and commerce and manufactures which has had no parallel in the world's history. Contrast this state of things with the system pursued by the States of Europe. There fifty different States have at least five and twenty separate tariffs, and are obliged to maintain armies of Customs officials—embarrassing trade, and injuring the commerce of the country.

I am not prepared to say—it would be absurd to suppose—that by a union with Canada we will arrive at the same commercial prosperity as the United States have attained, but I do say that just as the union of those States has contributed to that result, so will our union produce corresponding advantages on a smaller scale. In connection with the opposition that this scheme has received, I would like to call attention to the fact that not only was the same style of argument used by the opponents of the union of the American States, but the objections came from the same class. At the close of the American war, when the pressure which had kept them together had nearly ceased to operate, the question of Union by a more indissoluble and by a closer bond, was brought before the American people for adoption or rejection, just as has been done in these Provinces—and it is rather singular that in that case as in this, the strongest objections were made by the smallest province. We find that while the more populous States acquiesced in the propriety of Union, little Rhode Island, with a population of 60,000, took three years before she would accept it,—just as Prince Edward Island is now the strongest in opposition to the present scheme. While upon this subject, let me say, in reference to the relative size

of these Provinces as compared with that of the American Provinces, before they went into Union, that there was not one of the thirteen States as populous as Lower Canada now is,—that no two of them had a population equal to that of Upper Canada now—that two of them had a smaller population than Prince Edward Island, the smallest of the British Provinces, has now.

Well, the union ultimately took place, and what was the result? A degree of prosperity which has astonished the whole civilized world. And well do the people of the United States appreciate it. What is it that now stirs the heart of that great nation to its inmost depths? Is it not their attachment to union?—their consciousness that upon union depends, to a large extent, their character, their prestige in the world, their national position? Is it not this which has plunged them into the most sanguinary war which history records? Is it, then, all a chimera they are fighting for? I do not suppose—I am not desirous of conveying the absurd idea, that all that union has done for them it will do for us; but what I do contend is, that it will largely improve our trade, our industry, our manufactures; that on a small scale, to be sure, but, to a large extent, it will develop every resource we have, and improve our prosperity.

But it may be contended that the union I am arguing for is not the one which is contemplated by the resolution before the house. That is true; and yet it is not the less true that every argument in favor of the larger union is an argument in favor of the lesser. The advantages may not be so great; but they are in the same line; and there is nobody who argues for the larger union that does not feel that if that is impracticable, the lesser union is a step in the right direction.

They might shrink from undertaking both at the same time—many might suppose that it would be too great a shock to our social frame work, if at the same moment we were to construct the Union of the Lower Provinces by an amalgamation of our Legislature, and erect a central machinery at the headquarters of the Federation. There is, therefore, much to be said in favor of the smaller Union, when the action of New Brunswick has rendered the discussion of the other question not a practical discussion. In the Lower Provinces at all events there are no distinctions of race, of creed, of commercial or territorial interest to separate us—united, we should have a broader field, a larger revenue, a less proportionate burden in the maintenance of civil government. If the time should come when we enter into Confederation, the Maritime Colonies, united, will form a more solid phalanx in the United Legislature—would be governed by a more united sentiment—would wield a powerful influence. Therefore, whether this Union should end with the Lower Colonies or should expand to Confederation, it will be alike useful to us—and I have great pleasure, therefore, in seconding the resolution introduced by the Provincial Secretary.

Reply of Mr. Annand.

Mr. ANNAND then rose and addressed the house as follows:

Mr. Speaker—It is now about a year since a resolution was laid on the table of this house requesting his Excellency to appoint delegates