

And so it is said, that we should have paid \$140,000 more on the article of Spirits alone, but the truth is we should only have paid the thirty cents a gallon, instead of the thirty-five cents as we did. In Newfoundland they pay a higher rate than we do, with a lower tariff, but in Canada they paid a lower rate with a higher tariff. In 1864, in Union, we should not have paid as much, for they only paid \$2.60 to our \$3.10. The tariff there is higher, but the rate lower, and why? Because manufactures have increased, and importations decreased. "No," it is objected, "it is because they are a poorer country." But the fact is they consume much more in proportion to the population than we do. Of all the articles upon which they have a specific tariff there are only two that we use in larger quantities than they. The consumption of tea and molasses is much greater here than in Canada? Why? We know that during the late war in the United States the Government put a high rate upon tea, and the consequence was that much of the tea that paid duty here was consumed out of the country. Then in Canada they have Sugar Refineries, and they use the golden syrup instead of molasses, because they can get it at a dollar a gallon, the same price they have to give for molasses in Upper Canada, on account of the expense of moving: The several rate for the Provinces in 1864 was as follows:

In Canada they paid	\$2.56 per head
" Nova Scotia they paid	2.69 "
" New Brunswick they paid	3 10 "
" Newfoundland they paid	3.65 "
" Prince Edward Island they paid	1.98 "

The whole amount of the revenues raised in these Provinces in that year was \$9,580,000. Apply to this the tariff of \$3.10, and we get \$1,670,000 more than was raised by all British North America out of the Union.

With regard to the North-West Territory, and its admission into the Union, that will be a matter for discussion for the General Government. The surplus revenue will not be taken to purchase that territory, but go to meet the cost of the Intercolonial Railroad and the improvements in Canada for purposes of the General Government. In Prince Edward Island it is said they are opposed to the Railroad, because they will not be directly benefited by it. But such an argument cannot be used in this Province. The Railroads now provided for under the Subsidy Act are:

Western Extension,	88 miles.
St. Stephen Branch,	18 "
Woodstock "	12 "
Fredericton "	21 "
Eastward Extension,	30 "
Albert Branch,	20 "

Total say, 190 "

For the same rate which we paid per head in 1864 we can have the Intercolonial Road and all these Branches without the expenditure of a penny more than we did:

On motion of Mr. SUTTON the debate and House here adjourned till tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

J. M.

#### THURSDAY, JUNE 28.

Mr. WETMORE by leave brought in the following bills.

" A Bill to revive and continue an Act to amend the law for the relief of insolvent Debtors."

" A bill relating to the Registry of Deeds and other instruments."

" A Bill to amend the law of evidence."

" A Bill to authorize the Justice of the Supreme Court to preside at trials in which the City of St. John is interested."

" A Bill relating to Debtors confined in Jail or on the limits."

" A Bill to provide for the registration of births and deaths."

#### CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE ON MR. FISHER'S RESOLUTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES.

Mr. TILLEY resumed.—I feel that I am trespassing upon the patience of this House in continuing my remarks upon this resolution; for it is well known that thirty-three of the members of this House have been elected in favour of the principles of this resolution now on the table, and some of the remaining eight for Union but against the Quebec Scheme. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) has taken exception to a great many of the provisions of the Quebec Scheme, therefore I feel myself called upon to occupy the attention of the House for a short time in discussing this question, but before taking up the principle points in the objections, I desire to reiterate the financial statement made yesterday, because it has been stated it was imaginary and there was nothing real in it. In the first place can there be any doubt about our being relieved from paying \$420,000 annually, that being the interest of our debt of \$7,000,000? Can there be any doubt about the construction of the Intercolonial Railway that under the arrangement of 1862 we would have to pay \$4 twelfths, whereas if we go into Union we will have to pay but one-thirteenth? Can there be any doubt but that the salaries of the Governor and Judges and the expenses of the collection and protection of the revenue will be paid by the General Government. The deficiency in the Post Office will be paid by the General Government, although it may be that there will be a charge upon newspapers the same as in Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) has not spoken upon

these points because he knows that they are unanswerable. If he had had a leg to stand upon he would have used the same arguments here that he formerly used in addressing his constituents. The very fact that he himself has given adhesion to Union upon some terms has taken away a great deal of the arguments which he used twelve months ago. I have just been informed by the Postmaster General that there is now a proposition before the Canadian Legislature to do away with the postage on newspapers. (Mr. Smith—very opportune.) There are many opportune circumstances which have convinced the public mind of the advantages of Union, while the late Government have not been favored by Providential circumstances or anything else. Let us look at some of the points which the late Attorney General considers objectionable. He says we have not a sufficient number of representatives in the upper branch of the Legislature. There might be some concessions made to us in this. When the arrangement was made, and representation by population was conceded, it was considered that there was a great protection given to the Maritime Provinces, for New Brunswick was to have one representative for every 25,000 of her population, Lower Canada one to every 50,000, and Upper Canada one to every 75,000. That was twenty-four representatives for Upper and twenty-four for Lower Canada, and twenty-four for the Maritime Provinces, and Newfoundland was to have four. In every case the interests of the Maritime Provinces are nearly identical, and there is scarcely an important question that can come up in which Lower Canada would not be with us. It has been said that Upper Canada wishes to buy the North West Territory, suppose such a question came up, and a majority of the people's representatives were in favor of the measure. It would still have to pass the Upper House, and twenty-four representatives of Upper Canada would vote for it, and the other fifty-two members against it. Is there not some protection in this? Again there is a protection in the fact that the number of representatives in the Upper Branch cannot be increased by the Crown. Suppose we had not that protection, the Government could come to the Upper Branch and say, unless you pass this Act we will increase your numbers and force it through. There were some remarks made in reference to the residence of the Legislative Councillors. The sixteenth paragraph, in reference to Lower Canada, says:

Each of the twenty-four Legislative Councillors representing Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature, shall be appointed to