

And first, there is the 80 cents a head, \$264,686
 Then there is the grant for expenses 60,000
 of the Local Government.
 And lastly, there is to be a further allowance of 80 cents a head until our population reaches 400,000, which I throw in, although we are not likely to receive it until the decennial census takes place in 1871, 55,214

Add to this the local revenue for the mines, crown lands, &c., which I put down at \$880,000
 155,000

And we have a total revenue of \$535,000
 with which to pay \$800,000, the sum appropriated for local objects last year, showing a deficiency of \$265,000 the very first year, and before the high tariff of Canada, the stamp duties, the newspaper tax, and the other ingenious expedients for raising money are brought into operation. I have said that the total revenue from all sources will be \$535,000. Let us see how far this would go towards the local expenses of the country. We last year granted—

For Education,	\$133,595
Board of Works, for services which will still be chargeable on our local revenue,	79,520
Roads and Bridges,	274,228
Legislative expenses,	46,420
	\$533,763

Here, then, we have four items absorbing the entire revenue you will have under Confederation, leaving unprovided for the following services, which were last year estimated to cost—agriculture, \$14,000; crown lands, \$18 500; mines department, \$17,595; packets and ferries within the province, \$11,070; miscellaneous, \$46,631; navigation securities, \$80,000; making a total of \$187,796, besides salaries, coroners inquests, public printing, &c. This enormous deficiency can only be made up in one way—in the way pointed out in the bill—in the way described by the hon member's own authority—the Hon. George Brown himself—by direct taxation on the people of this country. In the face of these facts—and I challenge their investigation—an attempt is made to influence the house by quoting some paltry figures from an article in the Globe, which, after making a show of opposition to the financial arrangements, finishes off with a declaration that "with all these faults we like the scheme."

The hon. member has spoken in contemptuous terms of our "foreign allies." Sir, we have no allies but the people of this country, whose "upturned faces" he has ridiculed, and whose wishes he has the hardihood to despise. But it ill becomes that gentleman, so lately in very questionable company, to lecture us upon our allies. Who, when in London a few weeks ago, were his friends and conferees? In what respect is Mr. Cartier, the Attorney General for Canada East, who shouldered his musket and afterwards ran away, when Lower Canada was in rebellion in 1838, a better man than Mr. Banks? Then there is D'Arcy McGee, of cabbage garden notoriety; Galt, who headed an annexation movement in Montreal, when the Parliament buildings were burnt down and the Queen's Representative was pelted through the

streets. Another delegate is a born Yankee; the fourth is said to be looking to Washington; and the fifth, the chief scribe at the Quebec Conference, opposed the Union of the Provinces two or three years ago, because, in his then opinion, it would lead to separation from the mother country. These are the allies, the sworn bosom friends of the hon. member, who has dared to more than insinuate that my friend Mr. Howe and myself were in league with foreign allies and endeavouring to subvert British institutions. The hon. member has sneeringly said that my leader, Mr. Howe, and my follower, Mr. McDonald, spent months in London endeavouring to convince the British public. I reply to that gentleman, who was once a respected leader himself, but is now the humble follower of the Provincial Secretary, that we did largely influence the public mind and shake confidence in the Confederation scheme; and I had it from the lips of gentlemen in England, who did not share our opinions, that we had done much to educate the British public in respect to the position, resources and rights of these Maritime Provinces. We may not have succeeded in reaching the hearts of the Lords, for it was not to be expected that we would to any large extent operate upon the sympathies of a body so far removed from popular influences. We may not have succeeded in reaching the convictions of a majority of the Commons, but what opportunity had we? As every one knows, until Parliament meets, very few of the members are in town—they are scattered all over the country. We sent in our case to Earl Carnarvon, but when the bill was read a first time the correspondence was not on the table, and the Queen only had the bill submitted to her the day before it was introduced.

As I have said, on the third reading in the Lords, a large number of Peers withdrew, leaving only nine present, when one noble Lord had finished urging our case. Then it was sent to the Commons, and read a second time on the following day, contrary to the practice which has always prevailed there of giving at least a week between the first and second readings for the consideration of any important measure. So rapid was the action of the under Secretary for the Colonies, pressed on by those who are now pressing it on us, that the papers on which the members could alone form the judgment were not in their hands until the second morning, and one member stated that he had only time to read that clause of the bill, which refers to the Intercolonial Railway before the division on the second reading was taken. This reminds me that the member for Colchester has turned my attention to the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. It is well known that a guarantee was obtained for that work in 1862 through the exertions of Messrs. Hewe and Tilley, and but for the bad faith of the Canadians the railroad might have been finished to-day and working, as to whether working profitably or not, I will not undertake to say. He says I complained of the delegates getting only three millions instead of four, and further, that four millions were not asked for. If