

States. The Senate of the United States is composed of only 72 Senators, for that great and mighty country, containing thirty-five million people, with all the affairs of Empire to deal with, while this New Dominion, which is simply a subordinate Province of the Empire, and having a population of only 3,000,000, is to have 76 Senators after Newfoundland is admitted into the Union. In the House of Commons we are to have 181 members, while in the House of Representatives in the United States they have about 200, or possibly 230 members to deal with the affairs of a nation, therefore, either the machinery of the Government of the United States is too small, or that of the New Dominion is too large. I think the Parliament of the New Dominion is too large, they having nothing to do with the affairs of Empire, and nothing to do with the local affairs of the Provinces. I am satisfied that the expenses connected with the Government will be very large indeed, but how large I am not prepared to say. I am prepared to predict that the Tariff upon our people, at the very first Session of that Confederate Parliament, will be at least thirty per cent higher than it is now. I have already said that I believed we would have a stamp duty collected in this Province, which will be a very odious tax upon the people. There will also be a tax upon newspapers, for every means will be resorted to, in order to increase the revenue to meet the expenses required to keep up the General Government and the expenses connected with the construction of their public works. While these expenses are going on in the General Government, I do not think there will be any diminution in the expenses of the Legislature here. The duties connected with the office of Postmaster General will be transferred to the General Government and the office abolished, but there will be a new department established, that of Receiver General. Throughout the whole canvass at the last election, it was said that the expenses of this Legislature would be diminished, but is there any measure before the House to reduce the expenses? The Provincial Secretary will not deny that he told the people that the expenses of the Legislature would be less than formerly. Where do they intend to apply the pruning knife? It is not in reducing the number of members on the floors of the House: it is not in reducing the number of departmental officers, for one office is abolished, and another is established in its place. The Secretary can make calculations and predictions on one side of the question, but I should like to hear him make a calculation on the other side. He has told us of the smuggling going on across the boundary, but he did not tell

us it would be stopped, because it is evident that it will increase and add largely to our revenue, but I do not desire to go into a calculation in reference to it now, because it would not be of much practical value. I was sorry to hear, from the Secretary, when he was making his calculations, that we were to get 80 cents per head, only on the population of 1851 until 1871. I would like to ask the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Wilmot), who took all the credit to himself for the changes made in the Scheme, why the Delegates did not endeavor to get 80 cents a head on our present population, for they could, by calculating the increase of population in past ages, approximate what it would be now. Perhaps they did the best they could, for they were desirous of making all the changes that they could in the Quebec Scheme, but the only change that I see which will be of any benefit is the change allowing us 80 cents per head until the population reaches 400,000. I objected to giving to Canada such a preponderance in the number of representatives which she is allowed to have, and to the provision of the Scheme allowing a decennial increase of representation. I would have fixed the representation where it is, and not allowed any increase. There is a provision in the Scheme authorising the Parliament to increase the number of representatives, provided the proportionate representation of the Provinces prescribed by the Act is not violated. If they go on and increase the number some thirty, Upper Canada would have an entire majority of the whole. That is one provision of the Act which I object to, and there are many objectionable features in it, but I do not wish to take up the time by speaking of them now. In regard to the Secretary's figures, I do not want to impugn them, for they may be right and they may be wrong. When he deals in imagination and speculation in regard to the amount which we will be entitled to in 1881 under the Act of Union, he does not tell us what our wants will be for Roads, Bridges and Schools at that time. He gives us only one side of the question. As the population increases their wants increase. I do not suppose that we appropriated one-half or one-third of the amount for Schools, Roads and Bridges, twenty years ago, that we are to appropriate this year, and even now we have not as much as we ought to have, for the late storms and freshets have done a great deal of damage. I will not take up any further time, for I suppose the Secretary will make another speech, and if he does so I will reply to him again.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY.—I cannot allow some parts of my hon. friend's remarks to pass without making a few observations, although on the whole I was

rather pleased with his speech, for he has not attacked the point and the position in which the country at the present time is most deeply interested, that is, the amount of money we will have at the present time for local purposes, and whether we will have it for the future without direct taxation. He said we would have in the next five years, or in the next seven years, a great deal more than we received this year, therefore, we would be in a great deal better position out of the Union than in it, but he has not attempted to disprove the statement that we will have during the next four years \$65,508 per annum more than we have at present, or that after 1871 we will have an annual surplus of \$120,871.

He said he would like to have me state what amount of Revenue we would have in 1871. I put it down at 12 per cent increase on the revenue of this year, provided the population paid the same as they do now. He says the increase on last year was owing to the fact that people had begun to find out facilities for defrauding the revenues of the United States. The tariff is being reduced in that country every year, so that there will not be the same inducement to smuggle, and there will not be the same opportunity for smuggling that there has been the past year, as their force of Revenue Officers was now more efficient than it ever was before. (Mr. Smith.—They have not been very successful at St. Stephen.) They have peculiar facilities for smuggling at the Port of St. Stephen, and it would be almost impossible to stop them. It has been the policy of the United States to reduce their debt, and as that is reduced, they will reduce their tariff, for they will find that excessive duties do not always produce the desired results. The speech made by my hon. friend to-day is a strong contrast to the arguments made use of in 1863, when I endeavored to show that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway would increase our population and expenditure, and we would be better able to provide for our local wants than we had been.

His arguments were then directly opposed to what they are now. He tells us now that if we build this road it will increase our population, which will increase our revenue. In the *Fredericton Reporter* we find a report of a speech delivered by him in 1863, in which he, speaking on the question concerning the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, says:—"The Railway Debt in Canada would be \$10 a head, while ours would be \$29 a head; in this connection he would ask whether, in addition to all we owe already, we were prepared to pay \$100,000 more, making in all \$492,000, we have to pay for interest, leaving ourselves only £40,000 per annum for all