The Herald.

VOL. I. CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1865. NO. 34.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

SATURDAY, April 1.

(Mr. Palmer's speech continued.)

Now, it is stated that the subsidy and the capitation tax to be granted to this Island would make ample compensation for the surrender of our revenue. That subsidy is £27,890, the capitation tax £20,250. The liabilities assumed by the federal Government would be £62,000. Now, this is pointed at and we are told that it will be sufficient for all our purposes. They are fixed amounts; and however much our revenue may increase, we are tied down to these amounts, and if united would have to give the whole increase to the general revenue. We may just take a glance at the state of our revenue and show what the increase is likely to be judging from what it has been for a number of years past. In 1850 the amount of our revenue was £18,000, and in 1864 it was £66,000; that is an increase of £48,000 in a space of fourteen years. Now, if we divide that amount, £48,000, by fourteen, it gives us £3,428 as the average annual increase for the last fourteen years. I think this is a fair way to ascertain what it is likely to be ten years hence. Multiply £3,428 by 10, then add that to the revenue for 1864 and you have what it is likely to be in 1874—£100,280. That would be the amount of our revenue ten years hence if it increases as it has done for the last fourteen years, and the probability is that the ratio of increase would be greater; for the more widely our resources are developed the greater the increased ratio would be to the revenue. Now, the whole amount of revenue which we can expect under confederation from all sources, ten years hence, would be £67,712, and if we are paying £100,000 it is easily seen that we would be subjected to a yearly loss of £32,568. That is a part of what some people call "the advantages of going into Confederation." I look upon it that these figures cannot be controverted, for they are taken from the best data; and I feel assured that the amount of our revenue under Confederation would not be sufficient to meet our growing wants, and we would have to resort to direct taxation, which we would feel much more severely than we do any taxes we have to pay at present. But we are told that under certain articles of the Report of the Convention we would enjoy the advantages of free trade! Well, free trade might answer Canada, but I cannot see what great benefits it would confer upon Prince Edward Island. Canada sends us a very small amount of what we want at present. The trade between this Island and Canada amounts to little or nothing at present, and I do not see why it would take a rapid increase if we should go into Confederation. I do not know what articles of merchandize it would give us exemption of duty from. By free trade I understand that reciprocity in different commodities by which, when you want to import an article from any country, you may pay for it in an article of your own: or by taking any article which you have to dispose of to a country where it would be received free of duty and purchasing what you want in return; but I do not know what we can go to market in Canada with except hard cash; and I do not think that will be any advantage to the country. I think it would be much better for us to trade with Great Britain and other countries which would take our articles of export in exchange for what we require. I do not see why free trade should be held up to us as an inducement to enter the Union, for if the Colonies are confederated together, where is the revenue to arise from? If articles of trade between these Colonies are exempt from duty, they must put a higher duty upon articles imported from Great Britain and other countries. Now, look at the state we would be thrown into. Immediately upon entering the Union we would have to sustain a tariff fifty per cent. higher than we do at present, with every prospect of it being greatly increased to meet the wants of the Confederate Government. Then we would have to import many articles from Great Britain or other countries which are not manufactured in Canada, and will not be for ages to come. Therefore I say let us remain as we are and not look to those delusive prospects of improving our condition by going into the Union. Then they tell us that the neighboring Republic is growing offensive, and the state of the military defences requires us to go into the Union. Well, I admit these premises, and I am sorry to think that the day seems not far distant when there will be great commotions. My experience while on the recent delegation to Canada has confirmed me in that opinion. The Canadians themselves were very apprehensive, and I learned from gentlemen of experience that their opinion was that the day was fast approaching when there would be a disturbance in the relations between Great Britain and the United States; and I found that one of the great inducements which was driving Canada into this scheme was the necessity for putting their Province in a state of defence; and many things which I have heard since has confirmed me in that opinion. But I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that we should be taxed for the expenses of the defences of Canada as high as the Canadians themselves. It has been said that we should make common cause with them—that their defences would be our defences—and that the frontiers of Canada would be the battle ground for Prince Edward Island. There may be a great deal of philanthropy in that, but when I look at the position and interests of Prince Edward Island I cannot subscribe to the philanthropy or the philosophy of that argument. They are right at the door of a powerful neighbor, and they must put up with their lot, as we have to put up with many inconveniences here which they never feel. They have great advantages which we do not possess. They have the advantages of Railroads and Canals; they have facilities for carrying on manufactures through their long winters; advantages of uninterrupted trade and of climate and others which we have not, and cannot have here. They are not shut up by an icebound coast for several months of the year as we are. Therefore I do not see that it would be fair for us to share equal burdens with them in the taxation which would be necessary for military defences. Nature defends us for half the year, and if we have disadvantages, we should be allowed to enjoy compensating advantages which nature affords us. It is impossible for Great Britain to have fleets on this side of the Atlantic without being in the vicinity of this Island. If, as I have said upon other occasions, the fleets of Great Britain intend to maintain themselves, they must guard well the mouths of the St. Lawrence and the approaches to the coal fields of Nova Scotia and Cape Briton, and that would be our protection. And there may be large sums of money expended by Canada without being in open warfare because they are so near the borders of the United States, and they must protect their frontier. We have seen an instance of this a few days ago, and why should we have to share in the expenditure of such sums? I see a large sum was voted a few days ago by the Canadian Parliament to compensate the Banks in Maine which had been robbed by parties in Saint Albans making a raid from Canada. There was a heavy expense incurred owing to the situation of their Province; and why should we be subjected to expenses of this kind? I should apologize for trespassing so long upon your time, but before I conclude I wish to say a word respecting representation, to show that it is a strong ground to object to the terms of the Report of the Convention. When the delegates met in this town, the Canadians came merely as spectators, and we invited them to propound their opinions of a different kind of Union from that which we were convened to consider—a Union of the Maritime Provinces. And when they disclosed their scheme of representation by population, I stood up on the floor of this very room and said I never would consent to such a proposition—that the interests of the people I represented would forbid me doing so. No question upon that or any other details of the scheme was ever taken here, but this we were given to understand by the Canadians, that, if the scheme of the Federal Union of all the Provinces were taken up and agreed to, the lower Provinces should each have equal representation with Canada in the Upper Chamber. But we found when we arrived at Quebec a very different conclusion was arrived at. They there gave us the number of representatives which you find in the report, viz:—Upper Canada 82, Lower Canada 65, Nova Scotia 19, New Brunswick 15, Newfoundland 8, and Prince Edward Island 5. So it will be seen that out of the whole number Canada has 147, and the Lower Provinces only 47, thereby giving a majority of 100 to Canada, above all the lower provinces combined. Now, when we urge this as an objection, we are told that, "it is true, but that we have the advantage of throwing our weight into the scale when a difference occurs between the two Canadas." That is mere delusion. We know that it is very little weight that the whole of the Lower Provinces will have—that there would be very little chance of carrying any measure against Canada. And as to deriving an advantage from the differences between the two Canadas, they know their own interests too well to allow any measure to be carried against them by a combination of that kind. Mr. Galt alludes to this on page 10 of his speech:—respecting the patronage of selecting Legislative Councellors, he remarks: "So far as Canada was concerned there was no likelihood of difficulty arising on this point, because the coalition which was formed between the Liberal and Conservative parties *would preclude any attempt calculated to injure the interest of either.*"

That is the way it would work. A coalition formed between those two provinces would be always found to exist if they were threatened with danger by a combined vote of the Maritime Provinces. And in the Upper House, where we were given to understand that the Lower Provinces would have equal representation with Canada, they managed to maintain a large majority there also. If anything like a desire to give us protection, or to do us justice had been entertained, they would have given us equal representation in the Upper House, instead of the merely nominal representation of four members which is allowed us by that report. The strong analogous case of the United States has often been referred to. Rhode Island, with a population of scarcely 200,000, has as many representatives in the Senate as Pensylvania, which has nearly 3,000,000. And those acquainted with history know that at the time the federal Government was formed there that question arose and was discussed with great spirit. Very nearly one half the people contended, if I recollect right, that each State should have an *equal* number of representatives in *Congress*, and the only way they could compromise it was to allow an equal number for each state in the Senate. That is the principle which should have been adopted here. For these reasons, and others which I might name, I must disagree to the report of the Quebec Convention. I have embodied these reasons for disagreeing to it in a resolution which I will read:—

Whereas this Colony has, for more than ninety years past, enjoyed the advantages of a separate Government and Legislature, and Her Majesty hath graciously conceded to the inhabitants thereof the management and control of their own affairs:

And whereas the local revenue, owing to the development of the agricultural resources and the expansion of the trade and commerce of the Colony, exhibits a satisfactory yearly increase, and promises, without imposing additional burthens on the people, to be equal to the requirements of the public service:

And whereas the taxation per head on the population, in the other North American Provinces, is now fifty per cent. greater than it is in Prince Edward Island:

And whereas, by the Report of the said Convention, various extensive and costly public works, in both the civil and military departments, are intended to be prosecuted in the other Provinces by the Government of the proposed Confederation, which would necessarily impose still greater taxation upon the people of the Confederated Provinces:

And whereas, from its insular position and the complete interruption of its foreign and intercolonial commerce for five months in the year, the people of Prince Edward Island, although they would be compelled by the terms of the proposed Union to assume equal burthens, would not participate equally with the people of the other Provinces in the use or advantages of those public works, or in the large sums of money expended in their construction:

And whereas the subsidy agreed to in the 63d Article of the Report of the said Convention, and the capitation grant of 80 cents per head of the population, named in the 64th Article, and agreed to be paid to this Island in full settlement of all future demands, is not a liberal compensation for the surrender of a separate Government, with the independent powers it now enjoys, its revenue, and all other the rights and privileges thereto belonging, and would very shortly become inadequate to meet the wants of the local Government, and consequently would necessitate a resort to direct taxation to supply the deficiency:

And whereas the supposed advantages of intercolonial free trade would be more than counterbalanced by the disadvantages resulting to this Colony from the existence of a high impost duty on the manufactures of Great Britain and the United States, inasmuch as the trade between this Island and the other British North American Provinces—which is at present very inconsiderable—does not warrant the belief that it will, for many years to come, be of any importance:

And whereas, while recognizing the obligation which imposes upon British colonists the duty of providing, as far as in their power, the means of self-defence, this House cannot agree to the principle, that an insulated Colony like Prince Edward Island should be required to contribute for this object as largely as the inhabitants of Provinces whose geographical position renders them more exposed to the assaults of an enemy, and who, in times of peace, are immediately benefitted by the public monies expended not only in the construction of fortifications, but also of useful public works:

And whereas the principle of representation by population would deprive this Colony of any appreciable influence in either Branch of the Legislature of the proposed Confederation:

Resolved therefore, unanimously, That the said Report of the Quebec Convention, however well adapted in any of its principles to the state and circumstances of the Continental Provinces, is in no respect just or suitable to Prince Edward Island, and would, if accepted, prove inimical to the prosperity and happiness of its inhabitants.

HON. MR. YEO: For my part, as far as my voice can go I will oppose going into confederation on the terms of the Quebec report. I think Cape Breton should be a warning to us, for that Island, it is well known, has not prospered since it was united to Nova Scotia. It has been quite neglected. No pains have been taken to develop its resources; and it would be just the same with us if we went into a union with Canada. They talk about the Railroad, but see what it will cost! The estimated cost is $16,000,000, and $9,000,000 would have to come off the Colonies. See what a position we would be in! This Island would be entirely ruined. Canada is greatly in debt already, and they are going in debt at a tremendous rate. If the other Colonies—Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—go into the union with Canada, perhaps we will have to go in too; but I am inclined to think they will keep clear of it, and it will be wisdom for us to do the same.

HON. MR. BEER: I do not intend to occupy much of your honors' time, for my opinion on this great question is already well known. I I may say, however, that the resolution just submitted by his honor the Attorney General embodies my views, and not mine only, but those, I believe, of the whole of your honors as well as nine tenths of the people of this Colony. I believe the Island is almost entirely opposed to such a union; and the more I think about it and try to study the subject, and look at it in all its various aspects, the more I dislike it, for I believe it would be utterly ruinous to the Colony. We are told that British Statesmen speak highly of it. There is no doubt but the Colonial Minister and others do speak highly of the Report; but we must remember that the late Duke of Newcastle spoke highly of the Report of the Land Commissioners, characterizing it "an able, impartial, and just" report. That was his opinion, but some of the parties interested — the proprietors — thought otherwise. They raised objections to it, and the Duke allowed it to go to the wall. Just so will it be with the Quebec Report. The Maritime Provinces, it would appear, think it is not applicable to them; to this Island in particular it would be ruinous; and British Statesmen will not urge us into what would be so injurious to us. I would first call the attention of your honors to the financial position we should be placed in, passing over the representation which we would be allowed in the Federal Legislature, and which would be so unjust to the Island. I would observe that it is well known and admitted that the expenditure of the several Colonies proposed to be confederated, for the year 1863, amounted to $13,350,832, and nothing of that sum was extraordinary expenditure. It was all expended in just the ordinary way. To which we must add for the future, in case the union takes place, the expense of the General Government and Parliament, at least $1,000,000 a year, some estimate it at a much larger sum; also the interest on the cost of building the Intercolonial Railway, estimated to cost from fifteen to twenty million dollars, say $1,000,000 a year. Standing army supposed to cost from one to three million dollars a year, say only $1,000,000. Interest on the contemplated expenditure for extending, deepening and widening the Canals, estimated to cost over forty million dollars, say $2,000,000 a year, and we then have the yearly expenditure of the General Government at $18,000,000. But for the sake of being entirely within the mark we will call it $16,000,000. Now it is admitted by the advocates of Union that we will have to pay our proportion according to population, and in that case the contribution required from Prince Edward Island would be two and a half per cent. of the whole, and estimating the annual expenditure at the reduced sum of $16,000,000, our proportion of that amount would be £125,000 a year. And what are we to receive in return? The whole amount which we would receive from the General Government would be about £60,000 a year; rather less than one half of what we would have to contribute. The result would be most disastrous. The Colony would be ruined; it would be drained of all its circulating medium, and we would be thrown back again to the old system of barter, on just as we were 25 or 30 years ago. Cape Breton and the Magdalene Islands are good examples of the condition to which we may expect to be reduced if we enter this union. Cape Breton has made little or no progress during the last 30 years; and I have been informed that a Revenue cutter is sent down from Canada to the Magdaline Islands every summer to gather up all the taxes that can be obtained, and away it is taken to Canada; nothing expended on the Islands. If we were united to Canada we might expect to receive our allowance of £60,000 just so long as we continue to contribute our share of the expense of the General Government. Should we fail to do this—and fail we should—we might then expect that our allowance would be confiscated. As a settler in the Colony, and the head of a family who have also settled here, I feel that I would not be doing my duty, either to my constituents, myself, my family or my adopted country were I to advocate this union. If I thought otherwise I certainly would be a strange man if I did not vote otherwise, for if the Island prosper I presume that I would participate in the general prosperity. Possibly some of the advocates of union may hold themselves in readiness to strike their tents, or slip their cables, in case the confederation is consummated, and be off to Canada or elsewhere, not so with me; I intend to remain on the Island, and consequently oppose any measure, which, I believe, will prove injurious to the Colony. One of the advocates of this confederation says that those who oppose the scheme must be either "Ignorant or prejudiced;" and yet this same advocate of union, in a published speech of his, delivered at the Caledonian Club, endeavours to make the impression that the people of Upper Canada are not subject to a general tax, but only to the municipal tax which they have to lay on themselves in order to get bridges built, roads to travel on, education for their children, and a variety of other things, which the Government do not do for them. Notwithstanding that they do all this themselves, that they have to pay a general tax to the Government of double the amount which we pay. That same advocate of union, in the same speech says: "Molasses is now far more highly taxed with us than elsewhere," while the facts of the case are that in Canada molasses is taxed five cents per gallon and ten per cent. advalorum—equal to sixpence per gallon,—fifty per cent. more than we pay on the Island, our tax being only fourpence per gallon. Possibly that staunch and gallant advocate of union would not like to be charged with either "Ignorance or prejudice." I shall not charge him with either, but leave him to reconcile these statements as best he can. Mr. Galt, in his speech at Sherbrooke, lets the Canadians know that the Maritime Provinces are expected to contribute as much as, or more than themselves, in proposition to their population. Speaking of the Maritime Provinces, Mr. Galt says: "We were not going into a partnership with Colonies which required our support in a financial point of view. They had always been able to pay their own way, and they were well able to pay their own way now. They even brought into the public exchequer an amount per head greater than we should contribute ourselves, and this because they were a more consuming people than we." So your honors will perceive that there is little chance of our entering the confederation without having to pay our full proportion of the General Revenue, and, as I have already shown, it will, in all human probability, be over £60,000 a year more than we receive from them. One of the advocates of union, I believe, states that Mr. Galt estimates that the General Government can be carried on for $13,000,000 a year. Now I would observe that this sum is less than it cost the several Colonies in the year 1863 when there was none of the extra expenditure going on which is now contemplated immediately on the confederation becoming a reality. But for the sake of argument we will suppose that so small a sum would suffice; still, at that rate our proportion would be over £100,000 a year. Some will say, if it is going to be so ruinous to Prince Edward Island, how do the Canadians sustain, and prosper under such heavy taxation? The answer is simply this: it is all expended among themselves; and if we join them, our share of the general expense would be drawn from us to be expended in Canada or elsewhere. One of the advocates of union, who favors our receiving a stationary and fixed income, sets down in the "Islander" a fixed allowance for Roads Bridges and Wharves of £10,000 a year; while this very year the Legislature has found it necessary to appropriate £12,000 for that service, and in a few years I have no doubt but £20,000 a year will be required. But if we enter the union, we will have to tax ourselves for all that we will require over 10,000 for Roads, Bridges and Wharves, the same as they do in Canada. I would like to refer to two or three other points connected with this question, but as our time is limited, and as his honor on my left (Mr. Henderson) will probably address you at some length, I will resume my seat.

HON. MR. HENDERSON: Your honors, when I consider all that has been said already within the walls of is building, as well as outside, on the highly important question of Confederation, I would not deem it necessary to extend my remarks on that subject to any great length. But on the other hand, the magnitude of the interests involved forbids my giving a silent vote on the Resolutions before this House. The condizions on which it is proposed that this Colony should enter into Confederation have been so thoroughly canvassed already, that the subject has become threadbare; therefore my remarks and your honors' attention shall be chiefly directed to points that do not so directly lie within the trodden path as those already indicated. Confederation has received its *quietus*, for the present, in New Brunswick, but its friends among ourselves appear to be so captivated with some grand ideas connected with it, as to be willing to "compass both sea and land to make some proselytes" to this their favorite scheme. And as some of them attribute the opposition which that scheme has to encounter, here and elsewhere, to "ignorance and prejudice" on the part of anti-Unionists—assertions which it is their duty either to prove or retract—I, for one, will endeavor to prove the contrary to be the case. It is not only our undoubted right, but also our positive duty to ourselves and to our posterity to enquire as carefully as we can into the character and institutions of any people, whether great or small, with whom we are called upon to cast in our lot, "for better, for worse," before we permit any such compact to be consummated. One or two brief extracts from the history of Canada may serve as an index to that enquiry. "A division of the Province into Upper and Lower Canada was effected in 1791; Mr. Pitt, the Minister of the day, observing that there was no probability of re-uniting the jarring interests of the inhabitants but by giving them two separate Legislatures. For many years the experiment appeared to succeed. In 1837, however, a rebellion burst forth, headed by Papineau, in Lower Canada, and McKenzie in Upper Canada." The historian adds, "Probably there never was an insurrection attempted with less reason or fewer grievances by which it might be justified." At length, after a suspension of the Canadian Constitution, and the dissolution of the two Legislatures, Lord Durham was sent out to assume the reins of Government. I suppose that all your honors know something of the events that followed—that the rebellion was crushed, order restored, and the present union effected on the basis of an Act passed on the 23rd of July, 1840, when Sir P. Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, was Governor General—that some of the more hot-headed of the Montreal folks, several years afterwards, made the Parliament building too hot for their Legislators, so that it was consumed to the ground with nearly all its contents. At a date still later, Royalty was so little respected in the same city, that the Governor General was perfumed with rotten eggs in its streets, and the "Stripes and Stars hoisted up to the breeze!!" The population of Canada West have so outgrown the basis of their present Union as to have brought the Governmental affairs nearly to a dead-lock for several years past; so that they have had no fewer than five Administrations during the short space of two years. Then came to the rescue the coalition project as a provisional palliative rather than a permanent remedy for existing evils—an arrangement that may enable them to hold together while a sense of danger from without tends to keep internal differences in the back ground, and still further, while they are straining every nerve to secure Confederation as a sovereign remedy for all their difficulties, present and prospective. But in order, so far as I am concerned, to repel the charge of "ignorance," and to cast it back in the face of those who prefer it, I may state, at this point, that I resided in Canada from the latter end of October, 1838, until the first of August, 1848. During that time, I was in positions to make fully as correct an estimate of Canadian affairs and character as that which some of our Delegates occupied during their sojourn in that great Province in the month of October last. For, while they appear never to have looked beyond the sunny side of any question or prospect presented to them, I could and did examine facts and events, so to speak, from Griffinton, as well as from the lovely mountain; from the lovely suburbs, as well as from the Quebec citadel. And well do I remember some of the more prominent scenes enacted in Griffinton during an election that came off in the year 1844. On that occasion, the leading rowdies of that place attempted to carry all before them; but when the 93rd Highlanders, then in the garrison, were called out, they very soon compelled them to draw in their horns, but not until they had succeeded in thoroughly smashing the windows, etc., of a Wesleyan Chapel in that section of Montreal. These hints are calculated to give us a bird's eye view of Canadian politics and their general proclivities. The way being now clear this far, it may be asked was it not right that the able statesmen of Canada should seek a safe and suitable way of escape for that Province from its internal, and of defence against its external troubles? It is right that they should do all this, but we deny their right to seek or obtain our humble assistance for any such objects without our receiving good security for a fair and just equivalent in return. Does the Report of the Quebec Conference secure to this Colony anything like justice in view of our peculiar position and circumstances? Let any one who may be able to do it with impartiality, fairly weigh the sweeping powers which the new constitution would place in the hands of the Federal Government, for the imposition of high tariffs and every description of taxes, and then, as a true patriot, affirm if he dare, that the terms of the Quebec Report are "just and liberal to Prince Edward Island." Some of our most ardent Unionists do acknowledge that the Quebec scheme "offers to us nothing that could, with any show of reason, be refused to us;" but they say that, on the other hand, we would derive so many indirect advantages from the union as would more than make up for the disadvantages complained of. Now, your honors, in this single admission and its appendix, which is but a sample of the many negatives in circulation, we have a clear proof that the more positive and substantial arguments in favor of Confederation, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, are as few and far between as the indirect benefits which that scheme would confer upon us would be. Had the Conference given any positive proof of a disposition to make any due allowance, in a financial point of view, for our insular position, as they did for Newfoundland—I, for one, would look upon the whole scheme in a very different light. But when the very reverse of this is the case, what conclusion can we come to but that, while Newfoundland was to be virtually purchased, we were to be as virtually sold, and made a mere convenience of for the Canadians. The Hon. George Brown, of Toronto, in one of his speeches delivered at Halifax, I believe, affirmed, in most emphatic terms, that it was not their own political necessities that induced them to desire a Federal Union. Let any one compare Mr. Brown's speech with the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Galt and the Hon. Mr. McGee delivered since, in Canada, on the same subject, and they will, I think, fail to discover any harmony between the former and the two latter. The New Brunswickers have given a most emphatic verdict against Confederation. This is very extraordinary, in view of all the advantages which they would derive from the Inter-Colonial Railway. It would enhance the value of every acre of their land. The price of every horse would be increased, as well as the demand for manual labor of every description. In fact, if any general advantages were ever to flow from the contemplated Union, which would extend beyond the Canadian boundaries, New Brunswick would be the very first to participate in them. Now, if it be still admitted that in this the New Brunswick people have not acted contrary to sound reason, I ask, would it not be perfect madness in us, with all our disadvantages, to accept the terms offered? But I suspect that the following extract, called "Correspondence relating to the Inter-Colonial Railway," will throw some light upon the subject. In a letter from Governor Gordon to the Governor General of Canada, the following occurs: "If a solemn agreement, deliberately made with two other Provinces, calmly considered, voluntarily entered into, confirmed by your Excellency's approved signature, is to be regarded as a thing of no weight, *what Provincial obligation may be looked upon as secure?* I cannot suppose your Excellency's advisers can be insensible to the responsibility attaching to the assumption of such a position; nor will I believe the people of Canada—even those who disapprove of the engagement of 1862—desire to see it overthrown at the risk of spreading abroad a suspicion which, even if unjust, cannot fail to be generally injurious—*that, in that country, important interests of a permanent character are lightly dealt with, and grave questions of inter-Colonial policy decided, not on their own merits, or in accordance with any fixed principle, but are taken up, trifled with, and abandoned, to suit the political exigencies of the passing hour.*" The plain fact is, that the people of New Brunswick have no confidence in the politicians of Canada. And when to this is added the anti-British haste with which it was attempted to force this scheme upon these Colonies which saw no immediate necessity for so radical a change in their constitution, as it was natural for them, their suspicions were aroused to no ordinary degree. I would remark here that the attitude of antagonism to the wishes, and I would say to the best interests, of their own constituents, maintained by some of our own politicians, reminds me of what a shrewd thinker said as illustrative of ingratitude. It was to this effect: "When you hand a ladder to a man to go up, he immediately turns his back upon you." If I were asked to describe a constituent representative in few words, I would say that he should be a miniature of his constituents; or, in other words, that he should reflect the lawful, constitutional, and well-ascertained wishes of his people. It is true that, in these times, important changes take place in the course of a few short years which materially change public opinion, as well as the aspects of public affairs; but still, under such a contingency, the politician's path of duty is a patient one. He should use the best means in his power to convince his supporters that his views are right, and conducive to their best interests; or, failing in that, he should either keep his own views politically in abeyance or leave it optional with his supporters to choose another representative. The "glory argument," as it is termed, is largely dwelt upon by our Unionists to a man, in pressing the claims of their hobby. That argument has been well answered by his honor the Attorney General, in his address lately delivered in the Temperance Hall; in which he showed that, with an independent gentleman from England as our Governor, our young men of talent and education find a more direct and sure path to recommendation and promotion than they would do under Confederation, when their chances would be, at the very best, but equal to 5 in 194. In fact, those who lay undue stress upon such arguments, in so far as I am concerned, may just as well try to make us believe that Jonah's gourd at Nineveh was superior to the palm trees of Palestine. Now, your honors, I must confess that when the "glory argument," as it is placed by a few of our Unionists, and their other tactics are taken together, they bring to my recollection the kite in the fable, which reads as follows:

"Once on a time a paper kite,
Was mounted to a wond'rous height,
When, giddy with its elevation,
It thus expressed self-admiration:
'See how you crowd of gazing people
Admire my flight above the steeple;
How would they wonder if they knew
All that a Kite like me can do?
Were I but free I'd take a flight,
And pierce the clouds beyond their sight,
But, ah! like a poor prisoner bound,
My string confines me to the ground;
I'd brave the eagle's towering wing,
Might I but fly without a string.'
It tugged and pulled while thus it spoke,
To break the string—at last it broke.
Deprived at once of all its stay,
In vain it tried to soar away;
Unable its own weight to bear,
It fluttered downward through the air;
Unable its own course to guide,
The winds soon plunged it in the tide.
Ah! foolish kite, thou hadst no wing,
How couldst thou fly without a string?"

The elevating "string" in those lines I take to signify the people's suffrages, which will not bear every degree of violent force without snapping assunder; but if it should be a cap that will fit no one, I will be all the better pleased. The defence question is the next that calls for serious attention; and on that also the Unionists and I are at issue. For while, like their prototypes in Canada, they represent our American neighbors as prepared to "gulp us up" at an early date—unlike the Canadians in regard to Canada, they discourage [illegible] self-defence. Whether that is true patriotism I will leave it for this House to judge. But time forbids my entering largely into the subject. It may be remarked, however, that in view of what the Government of Canada have lately done, and what they are still doing to strengthen friendly intercourse between the two countries, we may reasonably conclude that, if any serious differences should unfortunately arise, it will be occasioned by disputes about points of international law or policy between England and the United States. In that case, England herself will not shrink from taking her proper place in the quarrel, and these Colonies would do their best by her side. Whatever the British Government may advise us to do to strengthen the many ties which bind us to old England, and to her noble flag which has, for a "Thousand years, braved the battle and the breeze," I trust that we shall do it in a way worthy of our origin, and of our present advantages. These being an outline of my views and sentiments, how could I do otherwise than give my hearty support to the Resolution before the House?

HON. MR. ANDERSON: I do not intend to detain your honors long, but this is a question of such vital importance to the future well-being of this Colony, that I cannot give a silent vote upon it. I think it would be very imprudent for us to go into the proposed union upon the terms which are offered to us. What could we gain by it? As far as I can see, there is no chance of gaining anything, but there are many chances to lose. I think the offer is something like this: if we will give up one-half of our revenue to the Canadians, and allow them to tax us as much as they please, they would then take charge of us. We fought hard and contended long for Responsible Government, and are we now going to give up our constitution and say we are not able to govern ourselves? I do not think that any man or any body of men in Canada can know the wishes and wants of the people of this Island as well as we do ourselves. And are the people of this Island, which is marked out by the great Finger of Nature to be a separate Colony—parted from the other Provinces by an arm of the sea—and bound up by ice for a great part of the year, are we, I say, to be called upon to assist in building every mile of their Railway, and to contribute to the opening up of their Canals, which are more than a thousand miles away from us, and which can never be any benefit to us? If we had been told that they would not ask us to contribute towards their Railroads and Canals, and for opening up the communications to the North West Territory, but that they would expect us to contribute to the general defences of the Colonies, the scheme would be looked upon in a much more favorable light. I, for one, would not be so much opposed to it. I have heard some of the friends of Union say that, if the Colonies were united, all productions of, and articles manufactured in, the neighboring Provinces would be admitted here free of duty, and that, they thought, would be an advantage; but [illegible] now, without going into the Union? Can we not have free trade without giving up our independence? Look at New Brunswick, which stands in a far more favorable position for going into the Union, and would derive many advantages from it which we would not, being bounded by Canada, they can carry on their commerce and intercourse by railroad, in winter as well as in summer—the question has been brought fairly before the people, and, as far as we have heard the result of the elections, they are decidedly against going into the Union. Some of the most popular men in the Province have been rejected. Why, then, should we go into the Union when they, to whom it would be a much greater advantage, are opposed to it? We had better act cautiously, and not take a step in haste which we might regret for years, and which might be a misfortune to those who will come after us.