

## OUR PAPER.

We beg to announce that our next No. for this week will be issued on Saturday morning. Our contributors, both correspondents and advertisers, will greatly oblige by handing us in their favors as early as they possibly can. The number that we will strike off will be so large that our publisher's power will be tried to the utmost.

Gentlemen wishing to use an effectual engine to crush the iniquitous CONFEDERATION SCHEMERS had better call at our office and purchase copies for general circulation. These papers, so full of valuable articles, should, if possible, be placed in the hands of every elector in the Province. To our friends generally, we say,—We will to the utmost of our power do our duty in this noble and patriotic work, and we trust to merit and receive a renewal of the patronage which, so far, they have so liberally extended to us.

WE WILL NOT OFFER ANY PAPERS FOR SALE ON THE STREETS. We are already in receipt of orders from Westmorland, Charlotte and King's Counties, and expect orders from nearly every other County in the Province. Gentlemen wishing to circulate the paper will please call at our business office on Canterbury Street and purchase such quantities as they may require:

EDITORS' OFFICE,—Near the Post Office in Canterbury St., and over the Office of E. Lunt, Esq.

## The Patriot.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1865.

We re-produce from the columns of our able and estimable cotemporary, the *Globe*—whose manly and independent course on this great subject is worthy of praise—the following article, the first of a series on the subject of Confederation, (in reply to Messrs. Tilley, Gray, &c.) from the pen of one of the editors of this journal:

### CONFEDERATION.

No. I.

By a New Brunswicker.

Having attended nearly all of the Confederation meetings that we have had up to this time, and having listened with the most profound attention to the arguments, statements, and deductions of the various speakers, it may not be deemed inappropriate for me, as a native of New Brunswick, to express an opinion upon those reasonings and conclusions. At the outset, I will observe, that from a pretty intimate knowledge of the embarrassed political and financial state of Canada, I felt strong doubts as to our being likely to gain any material advantage from a union with her. Still I was open to conviction. I was, like hosts of other people here, inclined to think that—

"'Tis better to bear those evils we at present have,  
Than fly to others that we know not of."

unless it could be clearly and distinctly shown, that "in yielding to a restless spirit of change," we would not be doing that which in the proverb is described as, "jumping out of the frying pan into the fire!"

As regards Mr. Tilley's statements, it struck me, as it has another of your correspondents, as singular, that he could not twice in succession repeat his figures as to the *per capita* tax to which we are subject. On this one matter alone he has made some half-dozen statements, no two of which are the same. The figures stated by him so variously are thus,—\$3.20; \$2.75; \$2.10, and \$2.70 per head for New Brunswick while for Canada, he one night put down \$2.35 per head, and on another \$2.40! It is a little singular that, on this point, Mr. McCully has put down for Canada \$2.45! In a matter such as this, which is the very basis of their elaborate calculations, a little more care and less inconsistency would have been certainly advisable.

Mr. Tilley's general arguments have been designed to show that financially, we would not, if confederated, be in a worse position than that which we at present occupy; and that, in addition to this fact, we are to derive enormous advantages from the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. His

special calculations have been singular failures. He has attempted to prove the correctness of a glaring absurdity, and has, of course, spent his time for worse than nothing. To admit him correct would be to allow that the three Provinces, which, in the aggregate, have had heavy annual deficiencies, are to be able, by simply uniting them, to have more money for local purposes than they ever had before, and are to be able to go into the construction of costly public works; to keep up a double set of governments; to provide for the heavy military and naval expenditure that is to be undertaken, and all this while Canada is to withdraw from that fund which she now employs almost exclusively for general purposes, large sums of money for her local expenditure, which local expenditure, has now to be provided for by their municipalities by direct taxation, and is not, as with us, defrayed by the general government.

Mr. Tilley, in order to make out a case at all, financially, had to put down figures, the absurdities of which are so glaring that he has not found a single person to agree with him,—always excepting, of course, the *Morning News*. Among his figures, those for the Intercolonial Railway, for the collection and protection of the Revenue, and for Naval and Military expenditure are the most glaringly absurd; while, for the fortifications of Canada, upon which it is expected some \$14,000,000 are to be expended, he has not put down a farthing; and the Canal improvements of Canada, which are estimated to cost \$42,000,000, and "which are to be carried on simultaneously with the expenditure for the Intercolonial Railway," he has in a similar way ignored.

The Intercolonial Railway arguments I design making the subject of an independent article.

Mr. Tilley's arguments in favor of representation by population, in the unenviable position in which such a theory would place our thinly settled part of the Confederacy, are certainly, not more wise, than on the part of Mr. Tilley are they consistent. Certainly, the British principle, by which they pretended to be governed, is not conspicuous in "representation by population." Scotland, in Parliament, does not occupy a formidable position; but what position would she occupy, if compared with London—she had representation by population! The British principle does not recognize any such a theory. But let us look at home. Here is Mr. Tilley at the head of a Government for a succession of years, and yet, although he represents St. John with a population of nearly 50,000, he allows St. John (City and County) to be under the disadvantage of having only half the representation of five other Counties, which, combined, have only some 45,000! Is this consistency? "What's sauce for the goose, &c." If representation by population is correct when we are to be swamped by Canada, is it not at least as correct for St. John in our own Legislature to occupy her legitimate position, and not, as now, have in proportion to her population, only half the representation that is enjoyed by other Counties? Mr. Tilley, if his present faith is correct, to have been consistent, should here, like Geo. Brown in Canada, have taken his stand on this principle, and either carried it through or resigned.

Another subordinate argument used by Mr. Tilley has been the Free Trade one. Up to this time he has not pointed out the articles that we are to be enabled to send to Canada, nor named to us any that Canada cannot manufacture on as favorable terms as we. A significant fact on this point is, that, although the *Arabian* was running for years between Canada and this Province, (only enabled to do so through by being heavily subsidized by this Province,) while she came down crowded with the products and manufactures of Canada, SHE WENT BACK ENTIRELY EMPTY, except in the Fall, when she sometimes took a few barrels of Oysters. The idea of talking of Free Trade by adopting the extreme protective tariff of Canada, at which England so loudly exclaimed, and which Mr. Galt could only attempt to defend by answering that "the extreme financial necessities of their position compelled them to such a course," is certainly too absurd to mislead any man who has the slightest knowledge of political economy, or possesses the smallest share of common sense. IT IS EXTREME PROTECTION OF THE WORST POSSIBLE KIND—protection of the manufactures of Canada against ourselves. Mr. Tilley and the other advocates of Confederation being themselves the Judges!

It is the design of the writer to discuss this question coolly and fairly, and he thinks it not difficult

to meet conclusively all the sophistries, mis-called arguments, coined by Messrs. Tilley and Gray, and the other advocates of Confederation. Those he will examine in detail as time and space will allow.

### MR. TILLEY AND MOLASSES!

It was amusing to hear the great political economist, Mr. Tilley, "exercised" over the difficulty into which he stuck when he got into molasses! He could not for the life of him understand how it happened that the quantity of molasses used in New Brunswick per inhabitant is so enormously greater than is consumed in Canada. He confessed that to him it was an entirely hopeless problem—quite beyond the grasp of his wonderful abilities. The fact was there; he could not deny it—and know he is quite an adept generally at denying facts—but, this molasses?—it fairly choked him! His sophistries failed him. He confessed himself fairly, absolutely floored by—molasses!

By rather shallow sophistries he had sought to reason his audience into the belief that in Confederation we would pay no more than now, notwithstanding our tariff would have to be made from thirty-five to one hundred per cent higher than it is at present, and, in support of this view, he made all the capital he could of the fact that in New Brunswick we are paying more *per capita* than they are paying in Canada. But with the proposition he sought to establish, the molasses was a stubborn fact against him, that would not yield to his silly theory, twist, and screw, and contort it as he might. He did not see, or he did not wish to see, that it crushed his sophistries to atoms.

"We will pay no more in Confederation, when our tariff is increased from thirty-five to one hundred per cent., than we do now," ha? This is the fact, though, without sophistry, but a self-evident conclusion, as plain as that two and two are four. If, with our light tariff, we now pay \$3.20 per head, while Canada, with a tariff from thirty-five to one hundred per cent. higher than ours, only pays \$2.35 per head, when a tariff, to meet Canadian necessities, fifty per cent. higher than Canada's is now, comes to be forced upon us, instead of our paying \$3.20 per head, we will have to calculate upon from \$10 to \$12 per head—even the very babes having to be taken into the calculation as contributors.

And now, how is it, that; with our light tariff, we pay so much more per head than they do in Canada with their heavy tariff? Any one who is familiar with Canada, knows that the reason is simply this: *Two-fifths of the population of Canada are almost total non-consumers of dutiable goods.* In this Province we have no such class whatever. Any one, who, like the writer, has lived and done business in, and gone through Canada, and has mingled with the simple, inoffensive, unenergetic *habitués*, knows that they are content with what they can produce themselves: move seldom from home, and feel no very especial interest in such outside matters as the rate of the tariff or the price of—molasses!

It matters not to them whether there is a duty of some two cents per gallon as with us, or three times that amount, as in Canada, on the article that choked down the sapient Mr. Tilley. They don't consume it. If they can get a little tea they do well. If they have maple sugar, they make use of what little of it they have not traded away. If they have none, they use as a substitute—milk; but molasses? *Oh, Sacre!* That will do well enough to choke down Mr. Tilley with, but it's quite out of their reach!

And thus does this very simple article of molasses, which stood as such a stubborn fact in the way of the very profound Mr. Tilley, illustrate and explain