

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

3RD SESSION, 8TH PARLIAMENT, CANADA.

---

## SPEECHES

DELIVERED BY THE

*Hon. Messrs. Currie, Seymour, and Simpson,*

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

ON THE

SUBJECT OF THE CONFEDERATION OF THE BRITISH  
NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES.



Quebec:

PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO., 26, ST. URSULE STREET.  
1865.



# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

ON THE

## SUBJECT OF THE CONFEDERATION OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES.

---

### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, 7th February, 1865.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said that yesterday he had promised to give to the House to-day an explanation of the provision contained in the 14th resolution relating to the selection of members for the Legislative Council of the General Legislature. This resolution read as follows :—

14. The first selection of the Members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the Legislative Councils of the various Provinces, so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve; such Members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective Local Governments, and in such nomination due regard shall be had to the claims of the Members of the Legislative Council of the Opposition in each Province, so that all political parties may as nearly as possible be fairly represented.

And under it the first recommendation for the appointment of Legislative Councillors from Canada would, should the Confederation scheme be adopted, come from the existing Government of this province. In making such recommendations, the spirit of the resolution would be carefully observed, and both sides in this House and as well life as elected members, be equally considered and fairly represented in the new Parliament.

HON. MR. FLINT begged to inquire whether the resolutions before the House were in all respects the same as those sent to the members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said they were not in one particular precisely as first printed, there being a clause in those before the House to allow New Brunswick to impose a duty on timber and logs, and Nova Scotia on coal,

which was not found in the first; as for the other provinces, the imposition of such duties was reserved to the General Legislature. (Hear, hear, from Mr. CURRIE.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said he hoped that honorable members would rather aid in furthering the scheme than take pleasure in detecting the supposed causes of opposition. (Hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE asked whether the difference between the two sets of resolutions was merely a misprint.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL could not say whether it was owing to a misprint or to an error in the manuscript.

HON. MR. CURRIE again asked whether the members of the Conference had not signed the instrument containing its resolutions?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL could only say that the resolutions now before the House truly and expressly represented the conclusions the Conference had arrived at. (Hear, hear.) Those conclusions had not been changed.

HON. MR. CURRIE then rose and said that the measure now before the House was the most important one ever submitted to a Colonial Legislature, and he hoped to be able to approach it with entire freedom from party spirit, and without the purpose of finding out unnecessary objections. He hoped he would, at all times, be able to judge of the measures presented with the fairness and candour of a Canadian and a British subject. At the outset he would, however, say, that the project now before the House had taken the country by surprise. The first time he had ever addressed the House he was reported to have spoken thus:—

That by a course of legislation alike moderate, prudent and upright, it will yet be the lot of some present to live and see the day when Canada will be the centre of a noble British North American Confederacy extending from the Atlantic to the

Pacific—a Confederacy not born in war, or baptised in blood, but a Confederacy united by the bonds of friendship, held together by the strong ties of friendly commerce and mutual interests, and cemented by a common allegiance to the throne of Great Britain.

From this quotation it would be seen that then he was in favor of a Confederation of the several British North American Provinces, but he little thought then that within two short years such a scheme would be submitted to Parliament. He was still in favor of Confederation—(hear)—but it must be a Confederation founded on a just and equitable basis, upon principles which would be alike advantageous to all parts and injurious to none. If any other kind of Confederation were agreed upon, it would contain within itself the seeds of decay and dissolution. The project had been elaborately presented to the House by the gallant knight at the head of the Government, and by his able colleague, the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, and what reasons had they alleged in favor of it? He confessed he had been quite surprised at some of the arguments of the former. That hon. gentleman had stated that if the scheme were rejected, whether we would or would not, Canada would be forced by violence into the American Union, or placed upon an inclined plane which would carry us there. Now when men occupying high positions like the hon. member, assumed the responsibility of giving utterance to such startling opinions, they ought to be prepared to support them with very cogent reasons.

Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ—I am quite ready to give them.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE—If the case were as represented, it must be because we are quite defenceless, and that except in union with the Lower Provinces we were at the mercy of the United States. But what did the honorable member mean by the inclined plane? For his part, he had not heard of any desire on the part of the people of this province to change their political institutions and turn from the glorious flag under which many of them had fought and bled. Had anything been heard from abroad, to the effect that unless we accepted this scheme, England would cast us off or let us slide down the inclined plane? (Laughter) Yet these were the sole, or at least the chief, reasons alleged by that honorable member. Let us then ask ourselves whether the scheme provided a remedy for the threatened evils. Would Canada indeed be so physically strengthened sea-ward and land-ward by this alliance,

that in the event of aggression on the part of the United States, we would be rendered quite safe? It was easy to say that union gave strength, but would this union really give us strength? He could understand that union with a people contiguous would do so, but union with provinces 1,500 miles apart at the extreme points, was a very different thing, and more likely to be a source of weakness. In his mind it was like tying a small twine at the end of a large rope and saying it strengthened the whole line. When the honorable member said that Canada would be supported by all the military power of the Lower Provinces, we should not run away with the idea that this meant anything. What were the facts? Upon looking at the census of those provinces he found that the male population between the ages of 21 and 50—the extreme limits at which men bore arms—was 128,457, of which number 63,289 were chiefly employed on the water, that is, in the coasting trade and the fisheries, leaving 65,000 to assist in the defence of Canada. (Hear, hear.) Now, suppose a draft of one-third of these was made for military exigencies—and one-third would be a large proportion—we would have less than 22,000 men available for the service. Why, that would not be enough to defend their own frontier from aggression. Without referring to the causes which had led to the formation of the present Government, or to the extraordinary conduct of some of the public men composing it, he must nevertheless allude to the express objects they professed to have in view in coming together. And the principal object was a scheme of federation, but not the scheme now offered to the House. If he understood the matter at all, the Government was organized on the basis of a Confederation of Upper and Lower Canada first, in which Confederation the Lower Provinces might afterwards be admitted if they wished it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Not so.

Hon. Mr. CURRIE—He was not surprised at the dissent of the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands, for the leaders in both Houses had placed the larger object, that is the organization of a general Confederation, as the primary one. But the basis of the organization had been reduced to writing, and he held in his hand the paper which recapitulated the conditions. They were as follows:—“The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure, next session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will

permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West Territory to be incorporated into the same system of Government."

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The resolutions on the table fulfilled that promise.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Well, the honorable member's colleague, the President of the Council, did not mention the Lower Provinces otherwise than incidentally at the great meeting in South Oxford, and the Intercolonial Railway not at all. If his position (Hon. Mr. CURRIE'S) was correct, that the Confederation of Canada alone was the basis of the coalition, then they had not carried out their pledge, and he pronounced the scheme now propounded as the production of a number of self-appointed delegates, and not the measure the country expected. Then he had been surprised to find that in the Conference Canada had so small a representation. He very willingly admitted that we had very able men there, but they were few compared with the whole number of the Conference, and did not fairly represent the population and wealth of the country. The Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands had said, to be sure, that it did not make much difference as the votes were not taken by numbers but by the provinces; in other words, that Prince Edward Island, with its population of 80,000 souls, had as much to say as Canada with its millions.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The two sections of Canada voted separately.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That was not much better, for it made Prince Edward Island equal to Upper Canada, with nearly 1,500,000 of population. But all this apart, he maintained the country was not prepared to pass judgment upon this momentous question. It was the greatest matter that had ever been presented for its consideration, and it should be the aim of all to have it perfectly understood and approved of before it was adopted. We should seek to frame a Constitution which would last for ages. If any portion of the country were seriously opposed to the project, and it were carried through in spite of them, a wrong would be inflicted which would perpetuate itself in all coming time. If passed against the sense of a majority of Upper or Lower Canada, the act might lead to an agitation such as had never been witnessed, and which might be fraught with the most disastrous consequences. To prove that the country was not prepared for this sudden change, he would ask how many public meetings had been held in Upper Canada for the purpose of discussing it? He had heard of but one, and

that not very influential, where both sides of the question were discussed. The people had in fact been waiting for the programme, and to this moment it had not been supplied—certainly not in all its details. In a matter of this momentous importance, upon which the well-being of millions in the future might so much depend, he sincerely trusted the country would not be hurried, but that full time for discussion would be given to enable it to arrive at a safe verdict. (Hear.) It was said that all the Governments interested were in favor of the project, and it was well known that there was to be a dissolution of Parliament in one of the provinces; if so, where was the necessity for haste in Canada, unless indeed it was for the purpose of unduly influencing the other provinces? When the union between Upper and Lower Canada was effected, there had been no such impatience of delay. The Imperial Government had brought in a bill, copies of which were sent out, and submitted to the Parliament of Upper Canada—Lower Canada then had no Parliament to consult, and in its case there was less need of delay than now—the bill was sent home again approved, though meetings were held in Lower Canada strongly opposed to the measure, and to this day it is said it was forced upon an unwilling people. (Hear, hear, from some of the French members.) If time was then allowed, why should not time be allowed now, when a much more important union was in question? (Hear, hear.) Had the views of such eminent men as Lord Ellenborough and Lord Durham been duly appreciated in 1839, this Parliament would not now be met for the purpose of dissolving a union which had been unprofitable to one section, and unsatisfactory to the other. (Hear, hear, derisively.) He would now take the liberty to quote the views of Lord Durham, to which he had just alluded. They were as follows:

I am averse to every plan that has been proposed for giving an equal number of members to the two Provinces, in order to obtain the temporary end of out-numbering the French, because I think the same object will be obtained without any violation of the principles of representation, and without any such appearance of injustice in the scheme, as would set public opinion both in England and America strongly against it; and because, when emigration shall have increased the English population in the Upper Province, the adoption of such a principle would operate to defeat this very purpose it is intended to serve. It appears to me that any such elective arrangement founded on the present Provincial Divisions

would tend to defeat the purpose of Union, and perpetrate the idea of disunion.

He cited these pregnant words to indicate the danger of resorting to temporary expedients for the purpose of overcoming grave difficulties. If hon. members desired to establish a union under which the provinces would grow in wealth, power and importance, they must endeavor to make it as nearly infallible as fallible men could. He had already remarked that there had been but little discussion in Upper Canada on this subject, and he felt it ill became him, representing, as he did, a large constituency, to vote approbation before the people understood what the vote involved. In the Lower Provinces the people and the press seemed alive to the subject, for the latter teemed with articles for and against, all tending to give information which our population had not received. But speaking of the Lower Provinces, he was really afraid that some public men down there were disposed to exaggerate the advantages of a union with Canada, just as some of ours seemed prone to magnify the riches of the Lower Provinces. If we were going into a partnership, which he hoped would last if entered into—(hear, hear,)—we should not attempt to deceive each other, for if the people found they had been deceived, the compact would be short-lived. To give honorable members some idea of the manner in which the subject was presented by leading men in the provinces, he would read them an extract from the speech of a Mr. LYNCH, at a large meeting in Halifax, as reproduced by one of the organs of the Government there.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—What organ?

HON. MR. CURRIE—They had so many organs they did not seem to know them all. (Laughter.) He would now read from the speech in question:—

But we are told by others that we had better have nothing to do with Canada, because she is bankrupt. Canada bankrupt! I wish we were all such bankrupts. She is overflowing with wealth. This is now rapidly developing itself, and must eventually place her among the first nations of the earth. I have travelled over and examined that great country, and it would take more than all the time allotted to me to tell you of her wealth and resources. Her rivers are among the largest in the world, and her lakes are mighty inland oceans. I never had any idea of their extent until I stood on the shore of Lake Erie, saw before me a large square rigged ship, and was told that such was the class of vessels that navigated those waters. Why, sir, 7,000,000 tons of shipping trade upon those mighty lakes. Again, look at the growth of the population. Sixty years ago it was 60,000, now it is 3,000,000.

Upper Canada doubled her population in ten years, and Toronto, in the beginning of this century the abode of the red man of the forest, is now one of the finest cities of British America, with a population of 40,000. The soil is of the richest description, indeed it is only too much so. In some places rich alluvial deposit is found to the depth of 50 feet, and in many instances lands have yielded their crops for years without the aid of a spadeful of manure. Canada has not only the greatest yield but the best wheat in America. It is a well-known fact that the people of the United States in exporting their best flour mix it to a large extent with Canadian wheat, and in order to give you an idea of the increased growth of it I would inform you that while in ten years the wheat crop increased in the States 50 per cent. (an immense increase), it in the same time in Canada increased 400 per cent. The average crop is equal to that of the best wheat growing countries in Europe, while some places have yielded the almost incredible quantity of 100 bushels to the acre. The yield of last year was 27,000.

He only wished that this honorable gentleman alone had been mistaken, but even the Hon. Mr. TILLEY, one of the most distinguished statesmen of New Brunswick, had made the statement that our tariff was in fact only an eleven per cent. tariff. But all the errors were not on that side, for they need but turn to a celebrated speech of one of our own leading men—a speech regarded almost as an important state paper—and there it was stated that the United Provinces would become the third maritime power in the world. (Hear, Hear.) England, it said, was first, then the United States, and the speaker doubted if France could take the third rank before us. Our sea-going tonnage would be five millions, and our lake tonnage seven millions. These were vast figures, and it almost bewildered the mind to conceive their magnificent proportions. (Laughter.) Now supposing all these vessels were 500 tons each, it would require 14,000 to make up the sum, but unfortunately the census showed that we had but 803 sailors to navigate them—rather a small number it must be admitted for 14,000 ships. (Great laughter.) The way the mistake—to use the mildest expression—was made, was simple enough. The vessels were entered at the Custom Houses every time they came in and left port, and as some of them came into port 200 times in the year, as at Toronto for instance, their tonnage was counted 200 times. It was easy in this way to run up our inland marine to seven millions of tons. But then if the products of Canada were as great as Mr. LYNCH represented, why of course we would require

all those ships to carry away all that wheat. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He would be glad if he could tell as fine a story, but he could not do that and at the same time tell the truth. Then the Lower Provinces were told that our tariff averaged eleven per cent., but was it so? [The honorable member was here quoting from a speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, to which he had before alluded.]

HON. MR. ROSS—Read on.

HON. MR. CURRIE, reading on, immediately came to a paragraph explaining the 11 per cent. to mean the average of duties on the value of all imported goods, a large proportion of which were duty free.

HON. MR. ROSS—The statement was correct. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE then proceeded to show the truth in regard to the duties on staples and articles in domestic use in Canada. He said if honorable gentlemen would turn to the Trade and Navigation returns for 1864, they would find that in the first half of that year we imported and paid the following duties on eight kinds of commodities:

	Value.	Duty.
Cottons.....	\$3,277,985	\$644,381
Woolens.....	2,537,669	499,084
Tea, lbs., 3,048,567.....	1,059,674	275,126
Iron and hardware.....	776,225	151,422
Linen.....	421,543	84,136
Hats and Caps.....	281,197	55,546
Sugar.....	779,907	376,189
Sugar, refined.....	9,980	6,260
Coffee, green.....	89,016	20,449
		\$2,112,593

Thus hon. gentlemen would see we pay more than fifty per cent. on our sugar, nearly twenty-three per cent. on coffee, while upon tea we pay about twenty-six per cent. He was afraid that if the present condition of Canada was calmly considered we would be found going into the union in a state far different from the glowing representations of Hon. Mr. LYNCH. Let hon. members look at the trade of Canada for half of the year 1864, and they would find that the balance against us was \$9,999,000. Then there was the interest upon the public debt; interest upon loans to private individuals; bank dividends payable abroad, for much of the stock of our banks was held out of the province; the interest to loan companies and others; all to be added to the debit balance, and the picture of wealth conjured up would present a very different aspect. Indeed, he wondered how, with all these burdens, the country had borne up so well.—

In the next place, he objected to the manner in which the scheme had been brought down. Why, if the Government desired the House to vote favorably, did they not act and speak understandingly? Why did they not at once bring in the schemes for the local governments and the estimated cost of the Intercolonial Railway? He (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) did not object to the principle of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) No, and he believed there would be the most perfect unanimity on the subject, as there was among the delegates as to the principle of Confederation, but he asked to have, as part of the scheme, the cost of the railway, which seemed to be part and parcel of it. We knew little of this project, where it was to commence and where to end, or how many ends it was to have. We heard there was to be one branch from Truro to Pictou; and then it was said again that the road must pass through the valley of the St. John, and end in that city. Were we to accept the project without information? Were we to have a road to Halifax? to purchase the Grand Trunk to Rivière du Loup and the link from Truro to Halifax, all of them to enter and form part of the national railway? Notwithstanding the admitted talent of the delegates, he contended that a manifest injustice had been done to Canada, and especially to Upper Canada, in the distribution of the subsidies to the local governments. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that the subsidies change not with population, but remain fixed. They were as follows:—

Upper Canada.....	\$1,116,873 00
Lower Canada.....	889,248 00
Nova Scotia.....	264,000 00
New Brunswick.....	\$201,000
	63,000
	264,000 00
Prince Edward Island..	64,035
	89,043
	153,728 00
Newfoundland.....	98,110
	270,890
	369,000 00
	\$3,056,849 00

If a person was proposing to enter into a partnership he would naturally inquire into the assets of the other members of the intended firm. We knew what our assets were. We had the finest canals in the world, which had cost many millions.

HON. MR. ROSS—And they pay.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Place tolls on the St. Lawrence Canals and you will see what they pay. There was one canal that did pay, the Welland. In 1861 this work alone earned

a net revenue of \$184,289 50, over and above the costs of repair and management; and if you add to that amount the tolls unwisely refunded, \$56,474 63, you have an amount equal to five per cent. on the total expenditure on the Welland Canal, as shewn in the Report of the Commissioner of Public Works, up to the 1st January, 1862, and a margin of \$7,436 to the credit of this work. Then we had the St. Lawrence Canals, and if they did not pay it was because of the extravagance of the management and the system of toll on those works. (Hear.) It was reported that some people believed if we could only get Confederation we would have enough to pay for both the general and local governments, and so much more to spare that we would not know what to do with our money. What would be the revenue of the Confederation? Taking the year 1863 as the basis, we find the revenues of the proposed Confederation for that year, from customs and excise, to be as follows:

Canada.....	\$5,999,320 98
Newfoundland.....	\$496,896
Prince Edward Island..	153,520
Nova Scotia.....	861,989
New Brunswick.....	768,353
	2,280,752 00
	\$8,280,072 98

We will now consider the burdens to be assumed by the Confederation. Interest on the debt of Canada, \$3,812,514 01; interest on the debts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, of \$15,000,000, say \$750,000; interest on the debt of Newfoundland, of \$946,000, and the debt of Prince Edward Island, of \$240,673—\$59,333. Add to this the interest on the cost of constructing the Intercolonial Railway, not less than \$1,000,000 yearly, supposing it were to cost us but \$20,000,000, and the amount to be spent yearly for defensive purposes, \$1,000,000. And assuming that civil government and the cost of legislation should be no more for the Confederation than for Canada, which is certainly a reasonable view, we have for civil government, \$430,572 47; for legislation, \$627,377 92; judges' salaries, Lower Canada, \$115,755 55; judges' salaries, Upper Canada, \$157,690 33; emigration and quarantine, \$57,406 32; ocean and river service, \$511,356 40; lighthouses and coasts, \$102,724 75; fisheries, \$22,758 41; cost of collecting revenue and excise in Canada, \$401,561 41; local subsidies to provinces, \$3,056,849. Thus shewing a balance against revenue of \$3,825,

781 89; and if the canals are to be enlarged, as promised, an additional debt must be created of \$12,000,000 for such purpose,—another annual charge of \$600,000,—or a total balance against revenue of \$4,425,781 89. These gentlemen from the east were going to give us the Intercolonial Railway and enlarge our canals, but if to enlarge the canals, why were not the canals put in the Constitution?

HON. MR. DICKSON—They did not want to throw cold water upon it. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Why not give a guarantee for their enlargement? He found that the desirable improvement would entail an expense of \$12,000,000. As to the local subsidy, he regarded it as a farce, or as honey spread out to catch flies. As to the argument that the rejection of the scheme would injure our credit, he would ask whether the bondholders would not much prefer our present financial condition to one of fifteen millions of increased indebtedness, with nothing of value to show for it. If the people of England knew that Confederation and the Intercolonial Railway meant an increase of fifty per cent. on our tariff, they would not be so anxious for it. As to the representation in the Confederated Legislative Council, it was proposed to give Upper Canada and Lower Canada twenty-four members each, and to the Lower Provinces twenty-eight. That is, the 780,000 souls in the Lower Provinces would have four members more than Upper Canada with its million and a half. This proved that though Canada had talented men in the Conference, they either forgot our interests or sat there powerless. When the Legislative Council of Canada was made elective, his honorable friend near him (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) had stood up for the right of Upper Canada, as the Delegates should have done in the Conference. On the second reading of the bill to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, on the 14th March, 1856,—

Mr. BROWN moved, seconded by Mr. FOLEY, That it be an instruction to the Committee to amend the bill, by providing that the members of the Legislative Council shall be elected for four years, one-half retiring every second year.

Mr. GOULD moved, seconded by Mr. WRIGHT, That it be an instruction to the Committee to amend the bill by providing that the constituencies shall be arranged according to population, without regard to the division line between Upper and Lower Canada.

This amendment was supported by the Hon. Messrs. AIKINS, BROWN, CAMERON, CHRISTIE, FOLEY, FREEMAN, WILSON, and many leading reformers in Upper Canada.

And on the third reading of the bill on the 27th March,—

Mr. HARTMAN moved, seconded by Mr. CHRISTIE, That the bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, with a view to arrange the electoral divisions so as to embrace within each, as nearly as practicable, an equal population, and without regard to a division line between Upper and Lower Canada.

This amendment, although supported by Messrs. BROWN, CHRISTIE, and twenty other Upper Canada members, was not carried.

If representation by population were right in 1856, was it not equally right in 1865? But it might be said that the union was to be a federal one, whereas it was no such thing. It was neither federal nor legislative, but a mongrel between both. If the representation had been properly arranged, there would have been no necessity for honorable members vacating their seats. In that case, Upper Canada would have had 30, Lower Canada 24, and the Lower Provinces 18. Yesterday the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands had given reasons for abolishing the elective principle as applied to this House; but not over a year ago he had lauded the system, and he (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) had not heard the life members say a word in opposition. The system had got a fair trial of eight years, and had proved satisfactory, and would a few self-constituted delegates, with a dash of the pen, destroy that which had received the sanction of the country? He was never sent to this House to vote away its constitution—(hear, hear)—and before endorsing any such proposition he would wish to go to his constituents, and if they said yes, he would not oppose—(hear, hear)—but without that permission, he was not going to give a vote which might have the effect of giving him his seat for life. (Hear, hear.) He had heard of Lower Canada domination, but if this was the first taste of eastern domination, he wished no more of it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It was not a peculiarity of Canada, but the judgment of the whole Conference. (Hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—He then presumed it was not the proposition of the honorable member that the seat the people had given him should be given to the Crown; but it seemed he had passed under the domination of the Lower Provinces. (Laughter.) In 1849, the Legislature had made provision for the support of common schools in Canada, and had set aside one million acres of the best lands for that noble purpose. The lands, all

situate in Upper Canada, had been sold, and a fund of a million and a quarter accumulated, but with another stroke of the pen this, too, was to be scored out. In 1862, the Government of the day had brought down a bill to amend the Separate School Act of Upper Canada, and without expressing an opinion as to its merits, he might say it had produced a very strong feeling of indignation. A mass meeting was held in Toronto to condemn the bill, and the people were so exasperated that they had called upon certain members of the Government to resign. Other meetings were held, viz. :—

Meeting at Harrington, North Oxford, 25th March, 1863 :

*Resolved*,—That the Hon. W. MACDOUGALL has betrayed the interests of his constituents for the sake of office.

Meeting at East Nissouri, 6th April, 1863 ;

*Resolved*,—That this meeting, while viewing the manner in which the Hon. WM. MACDOUGALL has betrayed the interests of his constituents in supporting Mr. SCOTT'S Separate School Bill, believes it to be his duty to resign his seat in the Provincial Parliament as member for the North Riding of Oxford.

He had read these resolutions to show the feeling which then prevailed, and he might have quoted articles to prove that the measure was regarded as a most iniquitous one. He would give one or two from the *Globe* :—

We can hardly believe that a government based on the double majority, will permit an alteration in our common school system in defiance of the vote of an Upper Canadian majority.

March 20th.—The prospects of Mr. SCOTT'S bill in the Upper House are not very bright. When it was brought up from the Assembly, nobody rose to move the first reading, and Sir ETIENNE TACHE, who, it will be remembered, introduced this last Upper Canada Separate School Bill, which passed into law, was about to assume this responsibility, when Mr. MCCREA, the newly elected Councillor for the Western Division, came to the rescue.

The SPEAKER then very improperly suggested Mr. AIKINS as the seconder, an office which the member for the Home Division promptly declined. No one else appearing, Mr. LETELLIER, a French Canadian, seconded the motion. This is French domination with a vengeance. We are not astonished to find that there is a disposition to give the bill strong opposition, regardless of the consequences to the government.

April 11th.—The bill passed the second reading in the Legislative Council, 11 to 13 in favour of Upper Canada.

In spite of every temptation, Upper Canada stands true to her school system. The bill may pass as other infamies have passed our Legisla-

ture before, but it will not be by Upper Canada votes. If our school system is destroyed, Lower Canada must bear the shame of it.

April 21st.—Although the bill has passed both Houses, and no number of meetings can stay its progress, it is well for the people of Upper Canada to pronounce upon its merits. They are deeply hurt and mortified by this treatment they have received from Lower Canadians and traitors among their own representatives. A sense of personal wrong and injury exists which we have never witnessed in so great a degree before. The iron of Lower Canada domination seems to have touched the soul of the people and the wound rankles. The word contempt does not express the feeling which is manifested. There is a spice of bitterness about it which takes it out of that category.

But, notwithstanding these evidences of dissatisfaction, the act became law, and it remained for the present Government, by this scheme, to perpetuate the law. He was surprised that the Government, framed as it was, should become parties to such a scheme. They had not yet done with the school question. They proposed to protect the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, and a petition was on the table exhibiting what was desired. This was proof enough that the people were not satisfied; and whether or not the scheme of Confederation were adopted, the Government should bring in a measure to do the petitioners justice. Then from Upper Canada the Roman Catholics asked to be placed in a position precisely similar to that which the Protestants of Lower Canada were seeking, and if each of these minorities were suffering injustice, why should not their complaints be redressed before a Confederation took place? Let these measures prelude Confederation, and let not Parliament be asked to proceed blindfold. He was satisfied that if the Intercolonial Railway project were taken out of the scheme, we would not hear much about it afterwards. Some leading men in Halifax had said, "the Railway first, and Confederation next."

HON. MR. SANBORN—Hon. Mr. TILLEY had said that.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then it would be better to try the Confederation without the railway. It would, after all, be much easier for the members from the Lower Provinces to come to Ottawa than it used to be for the members from Sandwich to go to Montreal at the time of the union. The Grand Trunk Railway had cost the province a vast sum, but then it had been of vast service to the country. But where is the company that would keep the Intercolonial Railway running for its earnings,

the road and the rolling stock being made over to them as a gift? Suppose a merchant from Montreal wants to go to England, which road will he prefer? Why, he would go by way of Portland. Would any produce be sent over such a road? How much wheat was there sent over the Grand Trunk, even in winter?

HON. MR. FERRIER—A great deal.

HON. MR. CURRIE—How much from Montreal? And why did we hear complaints from Huron and Bruce?

SEVERAL VOICES—They have no railway there. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Was there not the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway passing through Huron? It was our duty to hesitate and not to press on at railway speed, but to act like prudent men. We were sent here to place a check upon hasty legislation. But was there ever such hasty legislation as this? Yet as the Government were strong in Parliament, they might attempt to press the measure without the consent of the people. If they do, however, pursue such a course, they will perhaps receive a check in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, for in these provinces they had no intention to pass the measure without a free and full discussion.

HON. MR. ROSS—Why, if it was good for them as the hon. member said, they might be glad to do it.

HON. MR. McCREA—If it was so unfavorable for Canada it must be in the same degree favorable to the Lower Provinces.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Oh, that does not by any means follow, they are a frugal, industrious and intelligent people, and it may be considered inadvisable by them to join a people who, in the short term of ten years, by a course of extravagance and prodigality increased the expenses of their government nearly four hundred per cent., independent of the increase of the public debt. They might also call to mind the Grand Trunk swindles.

HON. MR. ROSS—When the hon. member said that there had been Grand Trunk swindles, he said what was not correct.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Perhaps he used a wrong term. He meant Grand Trunk frauds. Those people might hesitate about connecting themselves with a people that had almost brought themselves to the verge of national bankruptcy, and loaded themselves with such a heavy tariff, they might recall to mind the political dishonesty of our public men, men who had so maligned and blackened the public character of each other as to require a wider stage and a new audience to witness

their future acts. They would also observe that all formerly connected with the Grand Trunk were urging this scheme forward. He then accused the Government of bad faith in bringing down these resolutions, instead of a measure simply for the Canadas; that the reform party only committed themselves to the latter scheme when Mr. BROWN entered the Cabinet, but now it was only secondary. To bear this out he read the following resolution adopted by that party:—

Moved by Mr. HOPE MCKENZIE, and seconded by Mr. MCGIVERIN—That we approve of the course which has been pursued by Mr. BROWN in the negotiations with the Government, and that we approve of the project of a Federal union of the Canadas, with provision for its extension to the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western territory, as one based on which the constitutional difficulties now existing should be settled. †

He was not personally opposed to Confederation in itself, but this measure was so defective that he could not support it, bearing, as it did, the seeds of decay apparent in its details. He heartily concurred in the views expressed recently at Halifax, by a distinguished Upper Canada Statesman—(MR. BROWN):—“On a survey of the whole case, I do think that there is no doubt as to the high advantages that would result from a union of all the colonies, provided that terms of union could be found just to all the contracting parties, and so framed as to secure harmony in the future administration of affairs. But it were wrong to conceal for a moment that the whole merit of the scheme of union may be completely marred by the character of its details.” He asked who would not say that the details of this measure did not so mar as to spoil the scheme. If we are to have a Confederation, let it be put upon a proper and permanent foundation, one that will be of advantage to this young and vigorous province, and he expressed the hope that only such a scheme would be sanctioned by Parliament. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

It being nearly six o'clock, Hon. Mr. ROSS moved to adjourn the debate till the morrow, which was carried.

The House then adjourned.

—o—

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1865.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR said:—Honorable gentlemen, I desire to make one or two re-

marks in reply to something which fell from my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in reference to the objections I took on a former occasion to the details of this scheme. That honorable gentleman, after explaining one or two minor points, disposed of the others by saying that I opposed everything. As that statement might imply, if honorable members of this House were not acquainted with me, that my course had been factious, I desire to state what I have opposed. Having been always a strong advocate of retrenchment and financial reform, I have opposed the exorbitant expenses of the Government. I have opposed the extravagance which has made the expenses of the civil government of Canada exceed those of any other country on the face of the globe, in proportion to the revenue. I have always opposed the expenditure of money without the authority of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I have always opposed the extravagant grants and subsidies to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend opposite (HON. MR. FERRIER) has spoken of the benefit of the Grand Trunk Railway, and of the great expenditure of English capitalists in the work. It is true the work was undertaken by them, but Canada has borne her full share—has fulfilled every agreement. And more than that, Canada has paid at the rate of thirty thousand dollars per mile for her railways; Canada has contributed \$15,142,000 in principal, and \$5,400,000 in interest, without taking into consideration a large number of smaller matters. If a calculation be made from these amounts, it will be found as I have stated, that Canada has paid at the rate of \$30,000 for all the railway which was required, namely, from Quebec to Toronto, which would have connected with the Great Western, and formed a Trunk line through the province to Sarnia. If large sums have been expended; if large sums have been squandered, have not English contractors benefited? Are the people of Canada to be blamed? The scheme was planned by English capitalists, and Canada fulfilled every obligation. (Hear, hear.) Now, there is another matter which I have opposed. I have always opposed the loose system of management of the Crown lands, a system by which our splendid domain has been frittered away. I do not mean my remarks on this subject to apply to my honorable friend,

the present Commissioner of Crown Lands. He has only been in office a few months, and I have not read his report. But I refer to the past, and I say that the whole of that domain has been squandered away in useless expenses. There is another matter which I have opposed—the Militia Bill of 1862. I admit that I opposed that measure. That was a measure which was going to entail upon the country an enormous expenditure, which would have exhausted our resources at a time when that expenditure was not required. Why, honorable gentlemen, was not the *Treaty* difficultly settled at the time? Had not the American Government complied with the demands of Great Britain, and what threatened us to authorize that expenditure? There is one expenditure which I opposed, which might perhaps be questioned. I opposed the Supply Bill in 1858, and I had then voting with me, my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands. (Hear, and laughter.) Whether that vote can be defended in a constitutional point of view, I cannot say; but every vote I have given in this House, or the other branch of the Legislature, has been given in accordance with what I conceived to be the interests of my native country. (Hear.) My honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, alluded the other day to the conservative feature of the Senate in the United States, in allowing the same representation to small states as to the larger states. But this does not at all affect the general arrangement, because the large majority are large states. But while my honorable friend approves of this portion, he should have expressed an opinion on the whole system. In the United States, no change of constitution can be effected without the consent of two-thirds of both branches of the Legislature, and that must afterwards be sanctioned by three-fourths of the state governments. This is a conservative feature also. Then, what are the constitutions of the state governments. I have here a clause taken from the constitution of one of the states (Connecticut), which provides that:—

Whenever a majority of the House of Representatives shall deem it necessary to alter or amend this constitution, they may propose such alterations and amendments, which proposed amendments shall be continued to the next general assembly, and be published with the laws which may have been passed at the same session, and if two-thirds of each house, at the next session of said assembly, shall approve the amend-

ments proposed, by yeas and nays, said amendments shall, by the secretary, be transmitted to the town clerk in each town in this State, whose duty it shall be to present the same to the inhabitants thereof, for their consideration, at a town meeting legally warned and held for that purpose; and if it shall appear in a manner provided by law, that a majority of the electors present at such meetings shall have approved such amendments, the same shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of this constitution.

That is the way one of the oldest states guards the rights and liberties of its people. Then here is another extract from the constitution of the state of Mississippi, one of the new states, showing how the people there are protected against hasty innovation:—

Whenever two-thirds of the general assembly shall deem it necessary to amend or change this constitution, they shall recommend to the electors, at the next election for members of the general assembly, to vote for or against a convention; and if it shall appear that a majority of the citizens of the state, voting for representatives, have voted for a convention, the general assembly shall, at their next session, call a convention, to consist of as many members as there may be in the general assembly, to be chosen by the qualified electors in the manner, and at the times and places of choosing members of the general assembly; which convention shall meet within three months after the said election, for the purpose of revising, amending, or changing the constitution.

Now, in addition to this, what have we seen? Have we not seen changes in the constitution latterly in respect to slavery, and have they acted upon this till they have been ratified by the state governments? Now, compare this mode of procedure with that adopted in regard to the scheme—and very properly called a scheme—of Confederation submitted to this House. How were these delegates called into existence? Are they not self-appointed? (Hear.) Did not the members of the Executive Council of Canada constitute themselves delegates? (Cries of “no, no,” and “yes.”) And the members of the Executive Councils of the Lower Provinces, did they not also constitute themselves delegates? They prepared a scheme which they have laid before Parliament, and what is that scheme? It was embodied in resolutions sent to members of the Legislature before the meeting of the House, marked “private,” both on the outside and inside. Did any honorable member feel himself at liberty to go before his constituents, and explain it to them? Did any honorable member feel himself at liberty to

call his constituents together, and say, here is a scheme on which I will have to vote at the next session of the Legislature? No, he could not do it. Some of the newspapers did publish what purported to be the resolutions, but were they copied all over the country so that the people might see and judge of them? No, they were not, and what was the reason? Did not the Provincial Secretary write his mandate to the press, that any newspaper that did not support Confederation, was not to receive the Government patronage. Not being an elective member, I did not feel myself at liberty to address the people on these resolutions. Did any member take them to his constituents and explain every detail of them?

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—Don't let the honorable member endeavor to create a false impression. I, for one, held two meetings a day for some time, and fully explained the scheme to my constituents.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Did my honorable friend tell them how much this Intercolonial Railway was to cost, or how much Upper Canada was to pay for it? That it was to be established by the Government, and kept up as a public work. I should be glad to hear my honorable friend on these points before a popular assemblage. (Hear, hear). We have been told by my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that concessions had to be made, but how were these concessions made? Unfortunately they were all made one way; they were made to the Lower Provinces. No concessions to Canada, East or West, but all in favor of the Lower Provinces. And could you expect anything else would be the result of the Convention, when the small province of Prince Edward Island, and the small province of Newfoundland, sent representatives in the same manner and the same number as the whole Province of Canada! Could it have been expected that the delegates from Canada would supply all the talent? However much I esteem the talents of the members of the Executive Council, I believe there are those in the Lower Provinces who possess the talent necessary to arrange a scheme of this kind. When Canada, with its 3,000,000 of population and \$11,000,000 of revenue, was represented there by twelve, and the Maritime Provinces, with only 800,000 of population and a revenue under \$3,000,000, was represented by nearly two to one, could it be expected that a favorable

arrangement could be made. (Hear.) My honorable friend says that they voted by provinces, but it was all the same. Now, what was the first concession? The first concession was in granting twenty eight members of this House to those provinces, with only 800,000 inhabitants and paying a small amount of revenue, whereas in Upper Canada we have 1,500,000 of population, and contribute \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 to the revenue, and yet have only twenty-four members. Here is the first concession to make the Lower Provinces come in to support the scheme. And is it not a fact that this House will have the control of the legislation to a certain extent, and are we not entitled to it? Then there is another point in connection with the Lower Provinces, which I will here notice. The franchise is lower there—it is almost universal. Persons entered upon the assessment roll for a small amount of personal property may vote for members of the Confederate Parliament. Here members are elected by persons assessed for real property to a certain amount. This is another matter which should have been attended to. It is not right that members should be sent to the General Parliament on these terms. (Hear, hear.) The whole scheme is, in fact, a history of concessions, and all on one side. The arrangement of the public debt at a rate per head, instead of according to revenue, is another mistake. My friend, the honorable for Saugeen (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON), whom I do not see in his place, stated the other day that my arguments were fallacious; that in this case the rate per head of population was the one which ought to be adopted. Is not the revenue the means of payment of the debt? Is population to be considered? I will satisfy my honorable friend that his reasoning was not correct, at least it is not what I would expect from a gentleman occupying the position he does in the country. Is population always wealth? No. It is wealth when it can be profitably employed; it is wealth when you can employ it in manufactures, or in the cultivation of good farming lands; but look at the case of Ireland, where population has been a source of poverty.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—What I said was, that past revenue was not a fair criterion of what each province was to pay. In future we would have a uniform tariff. I am sure that my honorable friend will not

say that in this country population is a source of poverty.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My honorable friend says he adopts one plan for the past and another for the future. What justice is there in that? We have only to look at the proposed system to see the effect it has. If New Brunswick, with a million revenue, be allowed to put her debt of seven millions upon the Confederation, then, upon the same rule, Canada should enter into the Confederation with all her debt and more. The estimated revenue of Canada is eleven millions. Any one could figure that out and see that Canada should have had no debt left for the local governments to pay; but on this principal of concession, why, of course, Canada must suffer. Now, to shew the working of the system, look at the effect of the rate of 80 cents a head. Upper Canada will pay \$1,540,000 to the General Government, and receive back \$1,120,000 for the Local Government. That is, supposing Upper Canada contributes two-thirds of the revenue of the united provinces. That has been admitted by one who now holds a high position in the Government. This is the fine scheme which my honorable friend from Saugeen lauds. You pay according to wealth, and the difference against Upper Canada is \$420,000, or in other words, Upper Canada pays \$1,540,000 out of one pocket and receives back \$1,120,000 in the other. This is the working of the system which has been carried out, very much against the interests of not only Upper Canada but all Canada. The third concession is the amount to be paid to Newfoundland, as a set-off against her not being indebted. There may be, I admit, a show of fairness in this, but the sum is a great deal too large. Canada will go on increasing, whereas from Newfoundland we can expect very little. The fourth matter is that of the 80 cents a head, to which I have just alluded, and I have shown the working of that, and it is decidedly against it. Then comes the \$63,000 a year to New Brunswick for ten years. I was very glad to hear my honorable friend from Saugeen (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON) disapprove of that. I am glad to find him, so strong a supporter of this scheme, admit that that was wrong. I have made my calculation in an Upper Canada point of view. So long as the union was maintained, however, my voice was never raised by way of comparison. I desire to maintain that union. (Hear, hear.) But

now we are forced to take this scheme as it is, without any amendment in any particular. I only now wish to point out that of the principal which this \$63,000 represents, and which my honorable friend from Saugeen cannot endorse. Upper Canada will have to pay \$367,000. Then \$150,000 a-year to Newfoundland is a sixth concession, made for worthless lands. This is equal to a capital of three millions. The lands of the other provinces are well taken care of; but those in Newfoundland, what are they worth? They are entirely valueless. When my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands has all these lands to control, I am sure he will have his hands full. The lands of other provinces were worth retaining, and they were left under their own management; but as these happened to be good for nothing, they were put upon the General Government. Had they been good for anything, they would also have been reserved. There is another question. It is proposed to take the government railways of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and make them provincial works. I suppose we shall be told that the canals of Canada are also taken, and made public works of the Confederation. But there is a very great difference between these. The railways had only an existence of a few years, they would be worn out soon, and must be kept up at the expense of the Confederate Government. What advantage could they be to the Confederate Government? What are our expenses now for public works? Have we not seen the tolls removed on our canals, and will it not be a part of the policy of the Confederate Government to remove the rates paid on these railways, and they will be kept up, as all public works are, at an enormous loss to the Government. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend from Niagara the other day, I thought, on one point, was not quite correct in what he said in respect to Upper Canada. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) From the census of 1861, I find that the cash-value of farms in Upper Canada was \$295,162,315, and in Lower Canada \$168,432,546, making a total of \$463,594,861. The live stock in Upper Canada was valued at \$53,227,516; in Lower Canada, \$24,572,124. Wheat, Upper Canada, \$24,640,425; Lower Canada, \$2,563,114. Other grains, Upper Canada, \$38,123,340; Lower Canada, \$23,534,703. Now, in timber, mineral wealth, manufactures and fisheries, Upper Canada is quite equal to

Lower Canada and the Maritime Provinces. I believe that if Upper Canada could be left alone, if it was not to be burthened and its back broken by these concessions, the whole of Canada would become still more prosperous, provided we did not enter into any further useless and wasteful expenditure. Compare these resources with those of the Lower Provinces! The gallant Premier, the other day, stated something with respect to the wealth of those provinces—with respect to their mines and timber. But the timber must become exhausted, and consequently that country cannot grow richer; whilst in Canada, with a good productive soil and an industrious population, we must go on increasing in wealth. What is the value of the mines which we are to get? In Nova Scotia the royalty on coal is only \$28,000, and the revenue derived from the gold fields, \$20,000; and what else have we to obtain from these provinces? Why, in Nova Scotia they have no timber, and consequently their revenue cannot increase; whilst we in Canada must inevitably go on and grow in prosperity, because the elements of our wealth are in the soil and climate. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Surely my honorable friend does not pretend to say that Nova Scotia cannot increase. Why, in the last year it has doubled.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—What else have they besides their coal fields? It is not pretended that they have any timber. If you increase the tariff, you will increase the revenue; but it must not be expected that the revenue can be doubled. They will lessen their consumption if you increase the tariff. It is fallacious reasoning to say that when you double the tariff you double the revenue.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—For the year 1859, the revenue of Nova Scotia was \$689,000, and it increased the next year to \$1,249,000, and went on increasing, and yet my honorable friend says that it cannot increase.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—I have not the statements which the honorable gentleman has quoted from, but the figures I have given are those of 1862. There are excise duties, but I believe that the local duties will be paid to the local governments. The complaint which has been made by Upper Canada has been, that although they contributed two-thirds or three-fourths of the revenue,

they did not possess a corresponding control of the legislation, and that they did not receive back in proportion to the amount they paid. Will this be remedied by this measure? Draw a line east of Montreal, and do you not find the control of the legislature there, in consequence of the concessions made to the Maritime Provinces?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The balance will be restored when the Red River comes in.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—I am afraid that no one here will live to see that country come in. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the speeches of my honorable friends, and I have read the reports of the debates in the other branch of the Legislature, and the only argument I have heard brought forward in favor of this scheme, is that it will strengthen the connection with the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) Now, honorable gentlemen, I yield to no one in saying that that connection ought not to be broken. I say we are infinitely better here under the flag of Great Britain than under that of the United States. (Hear, hear.) But no reason is assigned; we are not told in what way the connection is to be strengthened. Can you alter the geographical position of the country? Will you have any more people or means? Your revenue is not increased, nor is your population, nor is your geographical position altered. Is it because the people of the Lower Provinces are ready to expend a large sum for the defence of the country? Why, to show you what those provinces consider it necessary to do in this direction, I will read a short extract from a statement of the Financial Secretary of Nova Scotia:—

As regards the sum proposed to be granted for the militia—\$20,000—honorable gentlemen might think it a large amount in the present state of the finances; but, looking at the large sum already expended, and still being expended in Canada—the efforts being made in New Brunswick for a similar object—would it be creditable to us as Nova Scotians, particularly considering the efforts put forth by the British Government to protect us, to expend a less sum.

The large sum of \$20,000 was to be expended, and that at a time when the expensive Militia Bill, to which I have alluded, was before this House. (Hear, hear.) Twenty thousand dollars was the sum that was proposed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia, the next important colony to Canada, at a time

when we were told here that we were in danger from our neighbors across the line. But something more was said by the Financial Secretary. The present Premier was pressing to strike out this item and put \$8,000 instead, and the Financial Secretary said:

Under ordinary circumstances he would agree with the honorable member as to striking out the \$12,000 extra grant for the militia; but considering the large sum about to be expended on this service by New Brunswick, the enormous expenditure of the Home Government for our protection, and what they expected of us, he considered the appropriation necessary. He would be ashamed of the Government if they had not proposed this vote, and he was prepared to stand or fall by it, as he felt that the honor of the country was at stake.

The honor of the country was at stake in this \$20,000. New Brunswick the same year spent \$15,000. Now, I opposed the expensive Militia Bill submitted to this House; but then the Government had expended over half a million dollars a year in militia expenses; and I admit they are going on very properly now. (Hear, hear.) Then we have been told that this Confederation scheme is going to raise the credit of the country. My honorable friend from Saugeen ventured the statement that on the intelligence of the adoption of these resolutions in the Conference reaching England, funds rose fifteen to seventeen per cent. Now, does any honorable gentleman suppose for a moment that that was the cause for this rise. [A voice—It was.] I have here from the files of the London *Times*, the quotations of Canadian Securities, and on the 7th of November,—the date of His Excellency's letter, conveying information of the adoption of the scheme,—the inscribed stock was 86 to 90.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I stated a fact when I said that that rise took place in consequence of the resolutions. I would like my honorable friend to explain it in any other way.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—We know that there are various causes which operate in raising or depressing stocks in England, the rate of interest of the Bank of England, &c. Well, on the 7th of November as I said, the quotation was 86 to 90, and I find that on the 25th November, giving time for the news to reach England, it was only 88 to 92. And now, with a strong probability of the measure passing, what is the price? The last quotation is 81 to 83.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I suppose the honorable member knows the reason of this decline. Soon after what was done in the Conference was known in England, the St. Alban's raid took place, and the consequence of the events connected with that was a fall of 17 or 18 per cent. in our securities.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR.—In consequence of the wise policy of the statesmen of England friendly relations had been maintained with our neighbours. It is true the passport system was put on, but it is to be removed again, and all things are to become as they were before, with the exception, perhaps, of the Reciprocity Treaty. Every man of business knows that that rise in stocks was not caused by anything connected with the Confederation scheme. Why should it? What is it that increases the value of stocks and depreciates them? Is it not the confidence of capitalists who have invested in them, that the interest will be paid. But under this Confederation scheme will not our expenses be increased. This Intercolonial Railway must be built and kept up, and this must be at the cost of Canada. You have got your local governments to keep up, and you have got your Confederate Government to keep up, and if we look at the experience of the past, is it likely there will be any reduction in the future? (Hear, hear.) I have got figures here to shew what the cost of the two governments was before the union of the provinces. The whole expense of the government of Lower Canada, with the salaries of officers, &c., was £57,618. In Upper Canada we were as economical. We were then under the rule of the family compact, and a worse compact we might have. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) They were high-minded, and they did not stoop to matters of corruption, as others have done since. (Hear, hear.) The whole expenses of the two governments were only a little over £100,000 a year. What are they now? Some two years ago the expenses of the civil government alone, not including the cost of the militia, were \$3,000,000. Here, in a little more than twenty years, the expenses have increased seven-fold, notwithstanding that we have only one Government. Now, what are we to expect from the Confederate Government? Every honorable member knows that things must be made pleasant for everybody, and when you are forming a Confederate Government, these expenses must be continued. You cannot turn people adrift,

and you must either employ or pension them. Are we to suppose that because there is a Federation, these expenses will be lessened? I admit that in the Lower Provinces they have managed their affairs with less expense than we have. But now we will have the local governments to pay for. We will have another staff to keep up for each province, which will add very materially to our expenses. The money must come out of the pockets of the people, who will have to pay it either by direct or indirect taxation. What possible difference can it make to the people of this country, whether they pay it directly by taxation or in duties. Direct taxation must be imposed, and that to a large extent, by the local governments.

It being six o'clock, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

After the dinner recess,—

HON. MR. SEYMOUR, continuing his remarks, said—I think, honorable gentlemen, that, taking into consideration the vast importance of this scheme—its importance in a financial point of view alone, without saying one word about the principle of changing the constitution without consulting the people—there should be an appeal to the country before it is carried into effect. A point which I did not enter fully into before the recess was the argument that Confederation would strengthen the connection with the Mother Country. Now, do we not see all the financial reformers in England, with the *Times* and other influential organs of the press, which on financial grounds were desirous of separating the colonies from the present state, all advocating this measure in the warmest possible manner? Undoubtedly the imperial government will sanction the scheme, but it is the policy now of that Government to sanction anything of a local character that the colonies desire. Well, in addition to the press that is favorable to the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country, and financial reformers like GOLDWIN SMITH and others who have favored the same views, what was stated a short time ago by the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies to his constituents? In speaking of this scheme, he said it was favored by the Imperial Government for the purpose of preparing us for a change in our relations; for the purpose of educating us to defend ourselves. (Hear, hear.) Was it not very strong language, coming as it did from no less a personage than the Under Secretary for the

Colonies, that the Imperial Government is ready to favor a separation whenever we asked for it? (Hear, hear.) Now, I am not one of those honorable gentlemen who wish to see the day arrive when the colonies will ask for such separation. I am not one of those who wish to educate the people to that idea, but would rather impress upon them the paramount importance of endeavoring to maintain the union and connection with the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DEBEAUJEU—What is the opinion of the foreign press with regard to us? Has it not threatened us, so that it is our duty to be prepared?

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—I suppose my honorable friend alludes to the press of the neighboring republic. We have certainly seen some of those newspapers, but very few of them threatening to invade and overrun us, but have you heard anything of that kind from the Government of the country, and are not our relations with it of the most friendly character? Are you to be governed in your conduct by the rash utterances of a few newspapers,—perhaps sensation newspapers?

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—Has not Mr. SEWARD threatened us?

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Not since he entered the Government. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Yes, just before the last presidential election.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Well, that is a matter of very little importance. (Laughter.) Now, honorable gentlemen, I have shown that this scheme has no precedent, even on the other side of the line. Among all the wild republican theories of our neighbors, they have never proposed to change the Constitution in this manner—never changed it, at all events, without the consent of the people, obtained in some form or other. Reference has been made, I think, by my honorable friend in front (Hon. Mr. ROSS) to the union of England and Ireland. Well, every honorable member knows the means employed to bring about that union. MAX, in his *Constitutional History*, states that £1,500,000 sterling were spent in carrying it. But how was the representation dealt with in this case? Did England, being the richer country, possessing the largest share of wealth and capital, give a preponderance of the representation to Ireland, as we propose to give to the Lower Provinces?

HON. MR. ROSS—That was a legislative union, while in this the representation will be based on population.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—That does not affect the case. After the Irish union was effected, what was the representation of Ireland in the House of Commons? It was 100 members in a total number of 656; and in the House of Lords 28 Peers, in a House of 450 members. And although it was considered by England an absolute necessity that the union should be brought about, she did not give a preponderance, and scarcely a fair share, of the representation to the sister kingdom.

HON. MR. ROSS—That is because in the English Parliament they do not recognize the principle of representation by population.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friends will say that this proposed change is neither American nor English.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS—It is Canadian. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—No, it is neither one nor the other; it is a mongrel Constitution. (Laughter.) In England no important change in the laws is ever carried without being discussed in Parliament, session after session, followed by an appeal to the people upon it. Even so unimportant a change—or what would, in comparison with this scheme, be here regarded as so unimportant a change—as the extension of the franchise has been discussed in Parliament for years, and submitted to the people before passing into law. Now, I would like to enquire of honorable gentlemen, what are the legitimate functions of the Legislature of this country. Do we not assemble here for the purpose of enacting good and wholesome laws for the people? (Hear, hear.) Those laws may be repealed, if they chance not to meet public approval; but here you propose to change the Constitution—to change the whole fabric of society—in fact to revolutionize society, without asking the consent of the people, and without the possibility—at any rate, the reasonable possibility—of this important change ever being reconsidered. Does not this important subject affect every freeholder in the country as much as it affects us, and are there not thousands of people in the country who have as great an interest in it as the members of the Executive Council of Canada? And yet forsooth these gentlemen prepare a scheme, bring it down to this House, and tell the representa-

tives of the people that they are not at liberty to ascertain the wishes of the people respecting it, nor to alter it in any manner, but must take it as it is. Still we are told, notwithstanding all this, that this is freedom, and that we are a free people.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—You are at liberty either to accept or reject it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Well, that is all very well, but we are told we must accept the scheme as it is; and all the influence that the Government can use—which I fear will be successfully used—(hear, hear)—will be employed to carry it through without the people having an opportunity of saying yea or nay upon it. We are told it is not British to permit this—even to pass a short act allowing the people to vote upon it; but if this is not British, neither is the proposition itself. (Hear, hear.) I entreat honorable members not to pass a measure of this importance without delaying it some little time, at all events, for the purpose of obtaining an expression of public opinion upon it. The people who are to be governed by it, who are for all time to come to live under this Constitution, certainly have a right to be consulted before it is consummated; and for the special well-being of the country, I hope and trust it will not pass without affording them that opportunity. (Hear, hear.)

—o—

THURSDAY, February 16, 1865.

HON. MR. SIMPSON said—I think it was said by a wise man that there is nothing new under the sun. But had SOLOMON the scheme now before the House presented to him, he would probably have changed his opinion. Possibly nothing new can be said on the subject of representation by population, or even on the scheme now before the House; but representing, as I do, one of the largest and wealthiest constituencies in Upper Canada, I think it necessary for me to give my reasons for the position I have felt it my duty to take in reference thereto. It has been stated that the elections which have lately taken place have gone in favor of the Government; but, even if such were the case, how could it possibly be otherwise, seeing that men of all shades of politics have united in forming a happy family. We have seen those who have been for almost a life-

time antagonistic to each other opening their arms, as was so well and eloquently depicted the other evening by the honorable member from Montreal (Hon. Mr. FERRIER), and embracing each other; and we have been led to imagine that the millenium, so long predicted and anxiously looked for, has, so far as Canada is concerned at all events, at length arrived. (Laughter.) We are to have no more discord and no more strife, but are henceforth to live in harmony the one with the other. It has been asserted that in regard to myself I owe my return without opposition to the fact that I avowed myself in favor of the Confederation of the provinces on the basis submitted. This is not correct. I held no meetings; I made no speeches; and in no instance was I asked what were my views in regard to the scheme; and, if honorable gentlemen will permit me, I will read a portion of my short address to the electors. It is as follows:—

You will reasonably expect me to give my views on the important constitutional changes that are now contemplated. No one at all acquainted with the effects produced upon our legislation and on the general prosperity of the country, by the unhappy sectional difficulties existing between Upper and Lower Canada, but must have felt that some remedy should be found for those evils. Whether the very able gentlemen who have so strangely united to solve and remove these difficulties will be able to accomplish their praiseworthy task, time alone can tell. We need the details before being able to pronounce an opinion; but heartily (and I hope in common with every well-wisher of their country) I most earnestly pray that they may succeed.

It will be seen that here I simply state that the gentlemen who had so strangely come together would be entitled to the thanks of the country if they were able to agree upon a scheme which would solve the admitted difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. But as I have read from my address, so I still maintain that, before we can be expected to express an intelligent opinion, we ought not simply to have half a scheme, but the details of the scheme in its entirety. If we refer to the election in North Ontario, where the Honorable Provincial Secretary had been the representative, and who returned for re-election after accepting office in the present Government, we find that he was defeated by a gentleman (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) who is known to be an opponent to the project. And if we take the more recent election which occurred in South Ontario, we find the contest between

two gentlemen, both personal friends of my own, and both of whom were favorable to the principle, but who pledged themselves that before it became an accomplished fact, it should, so far as their vote would extend, be submitted for the approval of the people. And I would be greatly deceived if the gentleman who has now the honor to represent that riding in the other branch of the Legislature (Mr. GIBBS) shall be found supporting the scheme unless that course be first taken. We need the details before it is possible that we can pronounce upon the scheme and consider it on its merits.

HON. MR. ROSS—You have the details.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—The details are unfortunately the very things that are wanting—they are the marrow of the whole affair. (Hear, hear.) When the agitation for representation by population was first started in Upper Canada, I stated that I had no confidence in it as a cure for the evils we complained of, and I then, and have ever since, felt that it would be better for the two provinces to separate than to create sectional jealousies and strife by the demand for an increased representation, and the religious cries associated with it. For my part, I have never, like some honorable gentlemen of this House, attended and presided over that kind of political organizations known as conventions, not believing these to be the proper means of redressing the grievances under which the country labored. The effect of those conventions was to add fuel to the agitation which was already sundering the country. That such should be the result I deeply regret, inasmuch as some of the dearest friends I have in the world are not only Lower Canadians, but adherents of a different faith. The fruit of this sectional hostility and discord we now see in the demand which has sprung up for Federation with all its concomitant burdens. I can lay no blame to my conscience for having assisted to bring about so unnatural a state of things, and whatever may be the consequences of the new condition of political existence towards which we are apparently drifting, my skirts, I rejoice to say, are clear, for I have had no hand or part in it. We are told that if this scheme is carried out, Upper Canada will be entitled to the great advantage of having in the House of Commons of the Federal Government 17 additional members. But what real advantage is this to be to the country? Do we desire

17 additional members for the purpose of crushing Lower Canada—is that what is meant? I answer, no. But even supposing we have 17 additional members—supposing representation by population is conceded in the new order of things—what will be the gain to Upper Canada? Will these 17 new members cure the evils of which we complain? Will they be able to reduce the excessive expenditures under which we are now laboring, and which have been one of the causes of the agitation for constitutional changes? I do not believe a word of it. Supposing Upper Canada has a larger representation by that number than Lower Canada, you must remember that Lower Canada, with the Eastern Provinces, is entitled to 112 members; so that Upper Canada would still be in a large minority of the whole House. My honorable friend the member for Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) has brought before the House a number of valuable statistics bearing on this question, and I must say I deeply regret the members of the Government sitting in this Chamber have not attempted to refute them. If these figures were wrong, they were easily susceptible of being so proved, especially by so able a gentleman as the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands. But he has not attempted the task, inasmuch as he knows it would be a hopeless one. I hold in my hands a statement furnished by the Auditor General to the Minister of Finance, from which it appears that our debt amounts to \$75,578,000, and deducting sinking fund and bankers' balances, \$7,132,000, leaving a balance of \$68,446,000 as the actual debt of Canada, to be borne by the people of this province under any scheme that can be concocted. If we assume that the cost of the International Railway will be \$20,000,000—and from the experience afforded by the Grand Trunk there is too much reason to fear it will be double that amount—the proportion which Upper Canada would have to bear would be \$15,000,000, and this added to the already existing debt, would make our direct debt \$83,446,000. This increase in our debt will be one of the fruits of Confederation. But it may be said that the road will yield a revenue, though every member of the House who knows anything of railway statistics, and the character of the country to be traversed by the International Railway, must know that this is impossible. My honorable friend from Toronto (Hon.

Mr. ROSS) when he issued his flaming prospectus to the capitalists of England fondly hoped that the Grand Trunk would pay 11½ per cent. on the investment. But we know how these expectations have been disappointed by the actual result, and so far from there being grounds to hope that the Intercolonial Railway will occupy a better position, there is too much reason to fear that it will be still worse. Why, the cost of its maintenance could hardly be less than \$500,000 per annum beyond all its receipts. How then could such a work be considered to be of benefit to the country?

HON. MR. ROSS—In the same way as the canals—by cheapening the cost of transportation.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—This is impossible. It costs two cents per ton per mile to move freight by rail, and as the distance from Toronto to Halifax is 1168 miles, it would cost \$2.23 per barrel to move flour from Toronto to that port; while a barrel of flour can now be sent *via* the St. Lawrence at 50 cents or under, and *via* New York at 53 cents. Taking another view of the scheme, in its financial aspect, we find that Canada now contributes, in all forms, to the support of the General Government, over \$10,000,000 per annum. No one will say that we shall be called upon to contribute less under Confederation. And if we add to this sum the interest, at five per cent., on the additional debt of \$15,000,000 created by the proposed railway and the expense of two local governments, assuming them to cost \$1,000,000 each, which is below the mark, with \$1,000,000 to be expended annually on the militia, as well as our share of maintaining and running the railway, we will find that the people of the two Canadas will be called upon to contribute \$14,200,000 annually, instead of the \$10,000,000, as at present. And I would ask honorable gentlemen if the country is in a position to bear this additional burden? (Hear, hear.) Really, looking at the question of expense, I am not sure whether I would not be in favor of returning to the primitive system of administering the affairs of the country—in preference to having this scheme—by a Governor in Council. (Laughter.) For there is no question that our annual expenditure will be, under Confederation, at least many millions more than at present, with the cost added thereto of maintaining and running the Intercolonial Railway—a work which can never pay.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It was predicted when it was proposed to build the Rivière du Loup section of the Grand Trunk that it would never pay, but the fact is that for the last two years it has not only paid expenses, but has given a profit.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—I should not contradict the honorable gentleman, because he knows more about Grand Trunk matters than I do, or most other people; but my late respected friend, Mr. FREER, who was the lessee of that section during two or three years, told me that, while receiving a subsidy of \$18,000 per annum for running it, with the free use of four engines, and with a suitable equipment of rolling stock, it would have ruined him had he continued to work the line even on those apparently favorable terms.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It is perhaps useless for me to say anything more, as the honorable gentleman will not believe what I say, —(Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—Hear, hear)—but all I can state is, that a premium was offered for the lease of the line, but the company determined to take possession of it.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—But the real question is, what was the cost of original construction, the interest on that amount, and the cost of maintenance? Take these charges into account, and it would require a pretty large rental to cover them, much larger, I think, than any responsible person would offer for a lease of the line. As to the Intercolonial Railway, we have no information from the government respecting the route to be followed or the length or cost of the road; but from figures I have been able to obtain, the following may be taken to be nearly correct:—

	Miles built.	To be built.
From Halifax to Truro.....	65	..
.. Truro to Shediac.....	..	90
.. Shediac to St. John.....	108	..
.. St. John to St. Andrews (under contract).....	..	75
.. St. Andrews to Woodstock..	50	..
.. Woodstock to Rivier du Loup ..	..	160
	223	325

The total length of road from Rivière du Loup is 548 miles; add from Rivière du Loup to Quebec, 120 miles; Quebec to Montreal, 170 miles; Montreal to Toronto, about 330 miles; so that we have a total of 1,168 miles over which it is gravely proposed to send flour and other heavy produce during

the winter months. (Hear, hear.) As has been already stated, before a barrel of flour could reach Halifax from Toronto, it would be nearly eaten up in expenses. [An honorable member—There would be nothing left but the hoops. (Laughter.)] It has been urged that under Confederation an active trade would spring up between Canada and the Maritime Provinces. A trade in what? What have we to send them excepting flour and the coarser grains? The former, as has been shown, cannot be sent, and the latter they do not require. The principal articles of export from the Lower Provinces are fish, timber and ships. We can take a moderate quantity of fish; but our forests supply us with an abundance of timber, and the ship yards of Quebec turn out some of the finest sailing ships in the world. The true markets for the principal staples of export for these provinces are New York and Boston. Small vessels from thirty to fifty tons, laden with fish, run from the Maritime Provinces to these ports, where they dispose of their cargoes and purchase with the proceeds corn meal, flour, pork, molasses and other necessaries. But it has been left for our Canadian statesmen to propose new political alliances in order to divert trade and commerce from their natural channels. It is yet further said in favor of Confederation that it will increase our power of defence. In the ordinary acceptance of the term, union undoubtedly is strength; but there are cases in which union, instead of being a source of strength, is in reality an element of weakness. If we could attach the territory possessed by the moon to these provinces, and obtain the assistance for our joint defence of the man who is popularly supposed to inhabit that luminary, we might derive strength from the Confederation. (Laughter.) But although John Bull is accused of doing many foolish things, I am persuaded that the Mother Country is far too wise to entrust the lives of her valuable soldiers when sent to our defence—as in case of need I feel well assured they would be—in passing over a road so liable to attack and so easy of destruction by our neighbors on the other side, should we unfortunately ever become involved with them in war, which I sincerely pray may never occur. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion I have simply to say that I cannot possibly vote for the scheme before the House, and thereby deprive the wealthy and

intelligent freemen, who have twice elected me unanimously, of a constitution obtained by long years of struggle, without knowing what we have to offer them in its stead. (Cheers.)

—o—

FRIDAY, February 17, 1865.

HON. MR. CURRIE said—Hon. gentlemen, with the consent of my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. DICKSON) who is entitled to the floor, in consequence of having moved the adjournment of the debate, I rise for the purpose of proposing the resolution which for some length of time has been before the House, on the notice-paper. It is one which, I think, should commend itself to the good sense and impartial judgment of the members of this Honorable House; and I shall be surprised if it shall meet any degree of opposition from the hon. gentlemen representing the Government in this branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) The resolution is as follows:—

That upon a matter of such great importance as the proposed Confederation of this and certain other British colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations, without further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared.

It is not aimed at either the destruction or the defeat of the resolutions before the House. It simply asks for delay until such time as the people of the country can more fully express their views on the matter, than they have hitherto had an opportunity of doing. Hon. gentlemen, I stated, when I first addressed this Chamber in reference to the proposed address, that I was not opposed to the Confederation of the British Provinces in itself, but that I was opposed to many of the details embraced in the resolutions upon which this House is asked to found an Address to Her Majesty the Queen. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. ROSS) who followed me upon that occasion, stated among other things, that I had attempted to decry the Lower Provinces, and that I had attempted also to decry the credit of Canada. I appeal to hon. members present, who were good enough to listen to me on that occasion, to point out a single word which I said, reflecting upon the credit of the people of the eastern provinces. Instead of having said anything to their discredit, I thought

I had paid them a very high compliment. So far from reflecting upon the character of the public men of those provinces, I alluded to but one of them by name, the Hon. Mr. TILLEY, and I paid him the compliment, which he fully merits, of stating that he must be ranked among the leading and most prominent of British American statesmen. (Hear, hear.) As to my decrying the credit of Canada—if, to tell the truth—if, to speak the honest convictions of one's mind—if, to state to the world what the Public Accounts of our country tell us—if this be to decry the credit of our country—then I am guilty of the charge. But the hon. gentleman went on and told us, that my speech was so illogical that it was unworthy of notice.

HON. MR. ROSS—I did not say that.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The hon. gentleman said what amounted to that. And yet to my astonishment he found it necessary to reply to me in a speech four columns in length—a speech, however, in which he failed to controvert a single position which I had the honor to take on that occasion. Then I was charged with having attacked statements of fact made by our public men.

HON. MR. ROSS—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. CURRIE—The hon. gentleman from Toronto says “Hear, hear.” But I ask, is it not the duty of hon. gentlemen, standing on the floor of this House, to correct misstatements which have been sent to the country? Was I doing anything more than my duty, when, in my humble way, I endeavored to correct what, if not misstatements, were at least evidently incorrect statements? We have had too much of that kind of thing in this country. And since my hon. friend from Toronto (Hon. Mr. ROSS) has chosen to remind me of it, I must say that I think it is much to be regretted that certain statements have been made in this country, and sent from this country, which, instead of helping to build up our credit, have done much to injure it. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps I could not allude to anything more forcibly in point, than the flaming prospectus sent to the world under the auspices of my hon. friend from Toronto, in which he promised the confiding capitalists of England a dividend of 11½ per cent. on the stock they might subscribe to the Grand Trunk Railway.

HON. MR. ROSS—Was it not 11½? (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—No; he was not so modest as to put it at 11½. (Laughter.) It was 11½ per cent. I was charged with attacking the statements of the Hon. Mr. TILLEY. I stated, when last addressing the House, that Hon. Mr. TILLEY informed a public meeting—I think in St. John, New Brunswick—that the tariff of Canada was in fact an 11 per cent. tariff, and my hon. friend from Toronto said that Hon. Mr. TILLEY was correct in making that statement.

HON. MR. ROSS—What I said was that the average duty on the whole imports of the country, including the free goods, was 11 per cent.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then I must say that that is a very novel way of arriving at the tariff of a country—to take all the dutiable goods, to add to them all the free goods, and then to average the duty on the whole. It may be a very convenient, but it is not a correct or honest mode in my opinion.

HON. MR. ROSS—It is precisely what Hon. Mr. TILLEY did; and I did it in the same way.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend told us that our present able and talented Finance Minister had stated the tariff of our country to be an 11 per cent tariff. I asked my hon. friend when the Finance Minister stated that?

HON. MR. ROSS—I said that, taking the statements Hon. Mr. GALT had furnished with reference to the tariff of customs duties, and the amount of imports of dutiable and free goods, and finding the average of the whole to be 11 per cent., Hon. Mr. TILLEY had made a statement based on Hon. Mr. GALT's own figures.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I find the report makes my hon. friend say, that "The Hon. Mr. TILLEY had quoted the figures of our own Minister of Finance." He was wrong in that statement, because Hon. Mr. TILLEY, on the occasion I referred to, had quoted the figures furnished by the Comptroller of New Brunswick.

HON. MR. ROSS—The Comptroller of New Brunswick could not furnish the figures of the trade of Canada.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Surely my hon. friend will remember, that, to give official force to the statement of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, he said that, after the Comptroller of the province had reviewed our tariff, he came to the conclusion that it was but an 11 per cent. tariff. I quote from the report:—

Hon. Mr. TILLEY had quoted the figures of our own Minister of Finance, and the hon. member had represented him as not speaking the truth, but as, in effect, attempting to deceive those whom he addressed.

HON. MR. CURRIE begged to know when the Finance Minister of Canada had stated the average duties collected in Canada were 11 per cent. When he (Hon. Mr. Ross) desired to be no longer interrupted, I ceased to interrupt him, and he did not give me an answer to the question. But, if the hon. member from Toronto will turn to the celebrated speech of the Minister of Finance made only the other day at Sherbrooke, he will find that Hon. Mr. GALT puts the Canada tariff at 20 per cent.

HON. MR. ROSS—But he did not include the free goods; that is all.

HON. MR. CURRIE—No; he did not include the free goods. But I say that if he had taken the value of dutiable goods, as we find it given in the Trade Returns of 1863—the last complete returns for a year that we have—instead arriving at the conclusion that we had a tariff of only 20 per cent., he would have found that the actual duty on the dutiable goods imported in 1863 was 22½ per cent. (Hear, hear.) Then my hon. friend from Toronto came to the assistance of Mr. LYNCH of Halifax. And, not stopping there, he undertook the defence of the present President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) and the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. McDougall). I confess I was a little amused, and somewhat surprised to find my hon. friend from Toronto becoming the apologist and champion of those hon. gentlemen, who, I believe, are perfectly competent on all occasions to take care of themselves—even without the assistance of my hon. friend. (Hear, hear.) He next alluded to the propriety and necessity—when the people of Canada were on the point of forming a partnership with the other provinces—of our knowing what the assets of those provinces were—what stock they were bringing into the common concern. I had shewed that we had a great many valuable public works—some of them of a profitable character. My hon. friend told us that the Lower Provinces too were engaging in profitable works. He told us that New Brunswick had spent eight millions of dollars on railways, and Nova Scotia six millions—and that from those railways those provinces were getting a net revenue of \$140,000, or

\$70,000 a year each, which would go into the revenue of the General Government. Well, hon. gentlemen, when such statements are made on the floor of this House, they of course go abroad, and those who make them ought to be well satisfied that they are based on reliable facts.

HON. MR. ROSS—So they were.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Well, I was very much struck by the hon. gentlemen's statement. I was surprised to find it stated, in the first place, that those provinces had already spent so much on railways, and, in the next place, that those railways in the eastern provinces were so much more profitable and paid so much better than the railways in Canada. Now, I find, on looking at the Public Accounts of those provinces—the very latest available—that the New Brunswick railways cost \$4,275,000, and that the Nova Scotia railways cost \$4,696,288—that the New Brunswick railways in 1862 paid \$21,711 net, and the Nova Scotia railways, \$10,739—making together, instead of \$140,000 for the two provinces, as stated by my hon. friend from Toronto, the small sum of \$62,450. And this too, hon. gentlemen will bear in mind, was from new railways, or railways comparatively new—and they will find, if they take the trouble to examine the accounts, that the cost of the repairs of those railroads, as of every other railroad after it has become somewhat worn, is increasing year by year.

HON. MR. ROSS—The House will recollect that I took the figures which were prompted to me while speaking.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That is the mistake which, I fear, has been committed during the whole of this discussion. (Hear, hear.) Our public men have been too reckless in making statements—statements in the east, as to the prosperity of Canada; and statements in the west, as to the wealth, property and resources of those eastern provinces. Now, hon. gentlemen, let us look at our public works, which my hon. friend in a measure tried to be-little and decry.

HON. MR. ROSS—I did not be-little them; I said that indirectly they were of great value to the country.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Yes; and directly too. I find, by the Public Accounts of the province, that in 1863 the net revenue of our public works—all of which are going to the Confederate Government—yielded to

this province a net revenue of \$303,187—and that our public works cost this province, taking the amount set down in the statements of affairs of the province, \$25,931,168. So much for the stock—so far as the public works at all events are concerned—that this province is prepared to put into the partnership with the other provinces. (Hear, hear.) I shall refer no further to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Toronto in answer to the few words I addressed to the House the other day, beyond expressing my regret that my hon. friend should not merely have been dissatisfied with the statements I made, but that he should have called upon me to take exception to the style and the manner in which my remarks were submitted to the Honorable House.

HON. MR. ROSS—I said, the temper and tone.

HON. MR. CURRIE—From the attention you were kind enough to give me, hon. gentlemen, on that occasion, and from the way in which my remarks were received both by my political opponents and my political friends, I had hoped that I had not exceeded the bounds of propriety—that, neither in my temper nor in my tone had I violated the rules of this House. If I did so I regret it, and I may be allowed to express the hope that when my native land has paid one-fourth as much for my political education as it has paid for that of my hon. friend from Toronto—if my manners still fail to be those of a CHESTERFIELD, or my eloquence that of a PITT—I shall at all events be able to treat my fellow members with courtesy and propriety. (Hear, hear.) But, leaving these little matters to take care of themselves, I shall now allude to the strong pressure which seems, from some source or other, to be urging the representatives of the people of Canada, and the people themselves, to adopt this important scheme without that time for deliberate consideration which a matter of that kind is entitled to. I am satisfied that that pressure does not come from the people themselves. I am satisfied it does not come either from this or from the other branch of the Legislature. I entertain the fear, which has been expressed before, that it has been a pressure from without, which has been urging us to take this step too rapidly, I fear, for our country's good. It may be that the statesmen of Great Britain,

and that a great portion of the people of Great Britain are very anxious for this measure, and that the press of that country generally approves of it. But, when they rightly understand it—when parties holding our provincial securities know that Confederation means more debt, more taxation, and a worse public credit—we will have another cry coming from across the Atlantic. And when British manufacturers know that Confederation means a higher tariff on British goods, we shall have different views from them also, crossing the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen, when I left my constituency, I had little idea that this measure was going to be pressed upon the country in the manner in which I see the Government of the day are attempting to press it. I think we should pause before adopting these resolutions. I think we want some more information before we adopt them. Before we vote away our local constitutions—before we vote away in fact our whole constitution—we should know something of what we are going to get in place of what we are giving away. Did any hon. gentleman suppose, before he left his home, that we would not have the whole scheme of Confederation brought down to us, and be asked to pass a judgment on it, or to consider it at all events as a whole shere? I think we ought to be cautious in taking half a measure until we know what is the whole of it. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen will remember the caution with which the Parliament of England proceeded, in 1839, when dealing with the rights of the people of Canada. At that time there was an urgent necessity for a new Constitution for the people of Canada, and a great necessity for it, particularly in the eastern province. When the Government of the day brought down their resolutions—in something like the same shape as those now before the House—resolutions embodying the principle of a Legislative Union—the leader of the opposition, Lord STANLEY, claimed that the whole measure should be brought down; and the Government of the day was actually compelled, by the force of public opinion in and out of Parliament, to withdraw the resolutions, and to bring down their entire measure. (Hear, hear.) And are we to be less careful of our own constitutional rights—are we to guard more loosely the interests of ourselves and those who are to come after us—than the people

legislating for us three or four thousand miles away? Besides, we are asked by those resolutions to pledge our province—to what? To build the Intercolonial Railway, without knowing, as I stated the other day, where it is to run, or what it is to cost. Why do we not have the report of the able engineer sent to survey and report upon that work? Why is it delayed? Why is it attempted to hurry this measure through the Legislature, while we are in the dark with reference to that great undertaking? It may be that it is kept back designedly, and for the purpose of furthering this very measure, not here, but in other parts of British America.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is going too far. The report has not yet been made, and, that being the case, it is somewhat extraordinary to charge the Government with keeping it back.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Certainly; I think the case is bad enough, when the Government are charged merely with what they have done. And I have no desire to make an incorrect statement. But I will put it in this way: I think we have good reason to be surprised, that the Government should come down with their scheme, and submit it to the House, before they even themselves know what the work is to cost. (Hear, hear.) And ask this House and the country to pledge themselves to the construction of a work of which they do not even know the cost themselves. (Hear, hear.) But, if the report has not been prepared, we have been told in the public prints that the survey is either finished, or very nearly finished. The report, therefore, can soon be furnished; and, why should there be so much hurry and anxiety to pass these resolutions before we get it? Then, again, why do the Government not bring down those Schools Bills which have been promised? Why are the people, or why is Parliament, to have no opportunity of passing judgment upon those measures—the School Bill for Upper Canada, and the School Bill for Lower Canada—before this Confederation scheme is adopted? I cannot see the propriety of keeping back these matters; and I do not think the members of the Government can show any reason whatever why they should not be settled at once. That, hon. gentlemen, we should know something about the division of the public debt. If hon. gentlemen will take up the Public Accounts placed in their hands during the present session, they will find a statement of

the liabilities of this province, certifying the amount to be no less than \$77,203,282. Now it is well known that Canada is only allowed to take into the Confederation the debt of \$62,500,000. We have a right to ask how the other \$15,000,000 are to be paid? By whom are they to be assumed? What portion is Upper Canada to assume? What portion is Lower Canada to assume? (Hear, hear.) Then, hon. gentlemen, if we adopt these resolutions, and a bill based on them is brought into the Imperial Parliament and carried—look at the power which is given to the Confederate Parliament. They have the power to impose local taxation upon each of the separate provinces. I would like to know how that power is to be exercised; I would like to know whether it is to be a capitation tax, or an acreage tax upon the lands of the province, or whether it is to be a tax upon the general property of the province. I am sure there is no hon. gentleman present who would not like information on these points, before voting for this scheme. (Hear, hear.) Then, hon. gentlemen, there is another very important question—the question of the defence of these provinces—which within a few months has taken a shape which it never took before in the history of this country. I shall trespass on the attention of the House for few moments, while I read an extract from a very able report on that question, which ranks, and in time to come too will rank, deservedly high as a state paper. It is a memorandum of the Executive Council, dated — October, 1862, at the time the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration held office. And, whatever the errors of that Government might have been, however they may have been found fault with in other matters, I believe the people generally were of opinion that the stand which the Government took on that question, was one which entitled them to the respect and confidence of the community at large. The Government say in this memorandum:—

That they are not unwilling to try to the utmost to comply with the suggestions of the Imperial Government is evidenced by the manner in which the projected Intercolonial Railway has been entertained. Their conduct in this matter should relieve them from every imputation. At the same time, they insist that they are and must be allowed to be the best judges of the pressure which the provincial credit can sustain. They are prepared, subject to certain conditions, to encumber this credit with liabilities arising out of

the Intercolonial Railway, but they are not prepared to enter upon a lavish expenditure to build up a military system distasteful to the Canadian people, disproportionate to Canadian resources, and not called for by any circumstance of which they at present have cognizance.

That is, the arming and bringing into the field a force of 50,000 men.

His Grace, while promising liberal assistance, contends that any available supply of regular troops would be unequal to the defence of the province—and that the main dependence of such a country for defence must be upon its own people. Your Excellency's advisers would not be faithful to their own convictions or to the trust reposed in them, if they withheld an expression of their belief that without very large assistance any efforts or sacrifices of which the people of the province are capable, would not enable them successfully and for any lengthened period to repel invasion from the neighboring republic. They have relied for protection in some degree upon the fact, that under no conceivable circumstances will they provoke war with the United States, and if therefore Canada should become the theatre of war resulting from Imperial policy, while it would cheerfully put forth its strength in the defence of its soil, it would nevertheless be obliged to rely for its protection mainly upon Imperial resources; and in such an event it is their opinion that they would be justified in expecting to be assisted in the work of defence with the whole strength of the empire. It is not necessary at this stage of their history, to put forward assurances of the readiness of the Canadian people to assume whatever responsibilities belong to them as subjects of Her Majesty. Their devotion has been exhibited too often to be open to doubt or depreciation. They have made sacrifices that should relieve them from suspicion, and which Her Majesty's Government should remember as a pledge of their fidelity. No portion of the empire is exposed to sufferings and sacrifices equal to those which would inevitably fall upon this province in the event of war with the United States. No probable combination of regular troops and militia would preserve our soil from invading armies; and no fortune which the most sanguine dare hope for would prevent our most flourishing districts from being the battle field of the war. Our trade would be brought to a standstill, our industry would be paralyzed, our richest farming lands devastated, our towns and villages destroyed; homes, happy in peace, would be rendered miserable by war, and all as the result of events for the production of which Canada would be in no wise accountable.

And, hon. gentlemen, that is not only the language in times past of leading politicians in Canada. Hon. gentlemen may call to mind the writings and sayings to the same effect of men in the eastern provinces—men now holding high position under the Impe-

rial Government. One hon. gentlemen, to whom I have particular reference (Hon. JOSEPH HOWE) declared it was unreasonable to expect that we should defend ourselves against a foreign power, when we had no voice either in the declaring of war or the making of peace—that while we were quite ready, as in times past, to expose our persons and property to meet the invader at the threshold of our country, we were unwilling to take upon ourselves, as colonists, a duty which belonged to the parent state. But does this correspond with the views that are now adopted by the Ministry of the day? I hold in my hand an extract from a speech delivered by one of the most prominent members of the Government at a recent banquet in the city of Toronto. And what did that hon. gentlemen say? Speaking of the Conference at Quebec, he stated that “the delegates unanimously resolved that the United Provinces of British North America shall be placed at the earliest moment in a thorough state of defence.” Hon. gentlemen, I was not aware that the Imperial Government had ever cast off the burden of the defence of this province. But we are told by an hon. gentlemen, high in the Executive, that this Conference, self-appointed as it was, by a resolution that we do not see laid upon the table, promised to place the province in a thorough state of defence. Hon. gentlemen, what does that mean? It means an expenditure here of four or five millions of dollars annually, or else the statement exceeded the truth. Again the hon. gentleman stated:—“The Conference at Quebec did not separate before entering into a pledge to put the military and naval defences of the united provinces in the most complete and satisfactory position.” Before we discuss this scheme further—before we are called on to give a vote upon it—I say we ought to know something more with reference to this important matter. (Hear, hear). Hon. gentlemen may perhaps argue that there is no necessity for this question going to the people—no necessity for further time being allowed to the people of Upper Canada or of Canada generally to consider this matter. Why, hon. gentlemen, has it not been stated by every hon. member who has taken the floor to address the House on this question, that it is the most important question ever submitted to this, or any other British Colonial Legislature? And yet many of those hon. members are unwilling

that the people of this country should have any further time to consider this important matter—although, by the laws of our land, no municipality has a right to enact or pass a by-law creating a little petty debt, not to be paid off within a year, without submitting it first to the vote of the people. (Hear.) Hon. gentlemen assign as a reason why the matter should not be submitted to the people—that we have had a number of elections to this House since it was known that the scheme of Confederation was under the consideration of the Government, and that these elections went favorably to the scheme. I would ask, hon. gentlemen, how many elections have we had in Upper Canada since the scheme was printed and laid before the people? I would like to see the hon. gentlemen stand up, who has been elected to come here to vote upon this scheme since it was submitted to the people. It is true we have had one election in Upper Canada since that time—my hon. friend near me (Hon. Mr. SIMPSON) alluded to it yesterday—the election in South Ontario, a constituency until recently represented by one of the hon. gentlemen who entered the Ministry which brings this scheme before us—our present esteemed Vice-Chancellor of Upper Canada, Hon. Mr. MOWAT. What did the candidates say at that election? Both of them, as stated by my honorable friend, in asking the suffrages of the people, had to promise that, if elected to Parliament, they would vote for a submission of this scheme to the people. (Hear, hear.) And that is the last election we have had in Upper Canada. It is true that many honorable gentlemen now present, in their addresses to their several constituencies, when seeking election last fall, said they were in favor of a union of the British North American Provinces. But, hon. gentlemen, there is not a man in this Chamber, within the sound of my voice, who would not say the same. I am myself as much in favor of Confederation to-day as ever I was in my life; and I will challenge any one to say that at any time, on any public occasion, I ever said aught against the scheme of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) But, honorable gentlemen, when I look at this scheme, imperfect as I conceive it to be, it receives my opposition, not because it is a scheme for the Confederation of British North America, but because it is a scheme containing within itself the germs of its

destruction. The resolution before the House is not, as I said before, aimed at the destruction of the scheme, and I hope before the debate closes the Government will see the propriety and the advisability of granting the reasonable delay therein asked for. Suppose the Government concedes even the short delay of one month, it can do no possible harm to the measure. If the measure be good—if it be so desirable as the governments of the respective provinces tell us it is—the simple permitting it to stand over for a month will certainly not destroy it. If, on the other hand, it be bad—if it contain within itself the elements of decay—it is better to know it now than hereafter, when the resolutions will have been embodied in a Statute over which we have no control. To shew my own feeling in the matter, all I have to say is this: give a reasonable delay—allow the section of the country I have the honor to represent to speak on the subject, and if it be found to be the will of my constituents that the measure in its present shape be adopted, honorable gentlemen may be assured that I shall give them no further opposition; and that instead of doing everything in my power to impede the progress of these resolutions, I will do nothing to impede their progress through the House. “But,” say hon. gentlemen, “delay means defeat.” If it be a good measure—if it commend itself to the approval of the people, supported as it is by the most able and brilliant men in Parliament—the scheme is in no danger. And, hon. gentlemen, supposing a month's delay is granted, we will even then be further advanced with the measure than the people of the eastern provinces. The writs for the elections in New-Brunswick are returnable, if I mistake not, on the 25th March.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—On the 9th March.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then it will be at least the 21st or 22nd of March before the Legislature of that colony can be called together.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I misunderstood the statement made by my hon. friend. What I meant to say was that the Legislature of New Brunswick is expected to assemble on the 8th or 9th of March.

HON. M. CURRIE—Then they are going to hurry up matters there, I am sorry to hear, nearly as fast as in Canada, the people of which have not had the same opportunity,

at all events, of considering the question as the people of New Brunswick. The people of New Brunswick seem to be fully alive to the importance of this momentous question, and I hope that when their verdict is given it will be a well-considered verdict; but this we do know, that it will not be given until after a free and fair opportunity has been afforded them of discussing the question on its merits in all its bearings. My hon. friend from the Western Division (Hon. Mr. McCREA) really surprised me the other day when he declared that an elective Legislative Council was neither asked for nor desired by the people. My recollection is that the Council under the nominative system was a standing grievance in Lower Canada as well as in Upper Canada.

HON. MR. McCREA—That was before the union.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The demand arose that the Council should be elective.

HON. MR. McCREA—Not after the union.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend is, I can assure him, mistaken in stating that there were no petitions in favor of an elective Legislative Council at the time of the change. If my hon. friend will consult the Journals of Parliament, he will find there petitions for the change; he will find also that from the town of Cobourg a petition was received in favor of representation by population in this as well as in the other branch of the Legislature. But my hon. friend, in his ignorance of the facts of the case—although he certainly handled the subject with a good deal of ability, though not with the ability he usually puts forth when he has a good cause to plead—(a laugh)—made a statement which he could scarcely have considered before bringing it under the notice of the House. He said that a House appointed by the Crown would be more responsible to the people than the present House. That, hon. gentlemen, is certainly a new doctrine to me. If such would be the case, why, I ask, do you not apply the same system to the other branch of the Legislature? In such an event I feel assured that the Government of the day would have a much more comfortable and pleasant life of it than even the present Government, strong and talented as they undoubtedly are. (Laughter.) But, says my hon. friend, once more, the people of Canada are in favor of the scheme, in regard to which they have had ample time

for holding meetings and adopting petitions. But, I would ask what did most of the members even of this House know of the scheme when they first came to Quebec? Did we know as much about it then as we know now?

HON. MR. ROSS—Yes.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend from Toronto says, "Yes."

A HON. MEMBER—No.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Another hon. member replies, "no." I may say for myself that I have learned something even from the speech of my hon. friend from Toronto that I did not know before. The people of the country have been waiting, expecting this matter would be discussed in Parliament, and that the whole scheme would be presented so as enable of its being judged of as a whole. Unfortunately, however, it is only a part of the scheme which we have at this moment before the Council. I did not have the pleasure of hearing the whole of the remarks of my hon. friend from Montreal (Hon. Mr. FERRIER), but I was greatly interested in listening to the portion I did hear. I refer to what he said respecting the ministerial crisis in June last. I thought that the celebrated memorandum, which, by the bye, has since been in great part repudiated by the Government of the day, contained all the ministerial explanations. But that scene, so forcibly described by the hon. gentleman, where the President of the Council met the Attorney General East—

HON. MR. FERRIER—I did not say I saw it. I only heard of it.

HON. MR. CURRIE—When the Hon. Mr. CARTIER embraced the Hon. Mr. BROWN. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. FERRIER—I simply said it was so reported on the streets.

HON. MR. CURRIE—And the Hon. Mr. BROWN promised eternal allegiance to the Hon. Mr. CARTIER. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. FERRIER—I was simply giving the *on-dit* of the day. I said I know nothing whatever of it further than what I had heard on the streets.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I must have misunderstood my hon. friend. I thought he was a witness of the affecting scene. (Laughter.) But my hon. friend did tell the House something which was new to me, and which must have sounded as new to the country, when he said that the Grand Trunk Railway cost the people of Canada very little. The

hon. gentleman seemed to think that I was very much opposed to the Grand Trunk. But never in my life have I spoken a single word against the Grand Trunk as a railway. I believe there is no hon. gentleman who can possibly appreciate more highly the commercial advantages to this country of that work than I do. At the same time, I have taken occasion, and may do so again if the necessity requires it, to speak of some of the transactions connected with that undertaking. Let this work or any other public work come under the attention of this Chamber, and it will receive at my hands in the future, as in the past, that degree of consideration to which as a public work it is entitled. I hope the day is not far distant when the Grand Trunk will become what it ought to be, a strictly and entirely commercial work, and when the people of all classes and parties will look upon it with favor.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It is strictly a commercial work now.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend stated that it had cost the country a mere trifle. But unluckily the Public Accounts do not tell the same story, and they do not exactly confirm the views of my hon. friend in relation to this work. If he looks at the assets of the province—the valuables of the province—he will find there is a charge against the Grand Trunk of \$15,142,000 for debentures. And besides there is this little \$100,000 which has been used in redeeming the city of Montreal bonds. There is something more besides about subsidiary lines.

HON. MR. FERRIER—I spoke of the first capital investment.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend from the Erie Division (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) admitted in opening his case that this scheme was very much marred by its details. Admitting this—which is just the whole argument—that the details so greatly mar the scheme, it is much to be feared that the measure will not work so peacefully, usefully, or harmoniously as its originators expected, and I believe sincerely hoped it would do, because I do these hon. gentlemen the credit of believing that in devising a scheme which should be for the future as well as the present welfare of the country, they were animated by a desire to the very best they could under the circumstances. Their great error, in my opinion, lay in

their yielding too much on the part of Canada to gratify the eastern provinces, so as to enable them to bring about this scheme at the present moment. If the scheme is so marred in its details as to destroy the whole measure, why not reject it? Then my hon. friend alluded to the state of the country, just before the present Government was formed in terms which I hardly think he was justified in using. He claimed that the country was in a state of anarchy and confusion. Now, hon. gentlemen, I must say that for my part I saw none of that anarchy, and I must say very little of that confusion. I assert that there may be witnessed in other lands what was witnessed in this. We saw weak governments striving month after month to keep themselves in power, and we saw these governments daily and hourly attacked by a strong and wary opposition. But, hon. gentlemen, I have yet to learn that the giving of 17 additional members to Upper Canada and 47 members to the eastern provinces will ensure us against the same state of things in the future. It was very well put by the hon. member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) when he said if there was more patriotism on the part of our public men, and less desire to sacrifice the country for the good of party, we would not have had that state of confusion to which my hon. friend from the Erie Division has alluded. Then my hon. friend who represents the Erie Division, in order to fortify the position he took in supporting the scheme, took up the resolutions adopted by the Toronto Reform Convention in 1859. He stated that I was a delegate present at that convention; but I can only say that although elected a delegate, I took no part in the proceedings, and know nothing more of them than I learned from the public prints. The hon. gentleman, however, conveniently read only a part of the resolutions. But it must be admitted that these resolutions were the identical basis upon which the present Government was organized. This Government was organized for the express purpose of carrying out the arrangements embodied in the resolutions of that body. And, hon. gentlemen, a committee was appointed by the Toronto Convention, and that committee prepared a draft address to the public. That was submitted to the executive committee, and considered on the 15th of February, 1860, and was revised and sent to the country as

the address of the convention, of which the hon. member for Erie was a member, and over which he also presided as one of the vice-chairmen. And what did they say? That convention never intended that Parliament should change the Constitution or give us a new Constitution without consulting the people and allowing the public an opportunity of passing its judgment upon the proposed new Constitution. And how did this convention propose to secure the people the right of passing judgment upon so important a scheme as the adoption of a new Constitution? Here it is, in large type—and I have no doubt my hon. friend has often read it in going through his large, wealthy, and prosperous division.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—It was not presented to the convention.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I wish to put my hon. friend right. The meeting was held on the 23rd September, 1859, and it was presided over by the late Hon. ADAM FERGUSON, and my hon. friend, the member for Erie Division, and Mr. D. A. MACDONALD were vice-presidents. A special committee was appointed at that meeting to draft an address to the people of Upper Canada on the political affairs of the province in support of the resolutions then adopted. A draft of the address was submitted to the executive committee.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I was not a member of that committee.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The public meeting was held on the 15th February, 1860.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—And when was the address published?

HON. MR. CURRIE—It was published in this shape in February, 1860. Well, one of the provisions contained in that address was this:—"Secure these rights by a written constitution, ratified by the people, and incapable of alteration except by their formal sanction." Hon. gentlemen, I fear the hon. member for Erie Division will hardly be able to justify the course he feels called upon to take on this occasion by anything contained in the address or the resolutions of the Toronto convention. The hon. gentleman would never have thought of preparing such a scheme as this to be submitted to the members of such a convention. But think you that had such a scheme been presented they would not have demanded that it should be left to the people? Think you, hon. gentlemen, that that scheme would have met the approval

of that body in its present shape? I am sure that my hon. friend, warm as he now is in support of the scheme, could hardly have accepted such an issue. I am sure that even the present Government, backed as they are by a large majority in both branches of the Legislature, and possessing as they do a large amount of the talent,—I may say a majority of the talent—of Parliament, dare not bring such resolutions down as a Government measure and ask the Legislature to support them in carrying it through. Then my hon. friend thought that the scheme had gone through the length and breadth of the land. Hon. gentlemen, it is quite true that the resolutions have gone through the length and breadth of the land; but where has there been that discussion in Canada to which resolutions of so much importance are entitled—except in Lower Canada, where I am told that fifteen counties have repudiated the resolutions when they were submitted to public meetings? And in Upper Canada, where is the single instance of discussion of the facts having taken place except in the city of Toronto, where there was little or no discussion, and where it was promised that that city, like Quebec, should be made the seat of one of the local governments? I understood my hon. friend from Erie Division to take issue on the fact that the delegates to the Convention were not self-elective, and I heard my hon. friend from Montreal deny it also. But if you take up a copy of the resolutions and the despatches accompanying them, you will find that they were in every sense of the word self-elected. And if they were not self-elected, who deputed them to come and do what they have done? Did the basis on which the Government was formed authorize them to enter into this compact? The basis on which the Government was formed speaks for itself. The measure they promised the people of Upper Canada was simply a measure to settle the existing difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. They were to form Upper and Lower Canada into a federation upon such a basis as would hereafter allow the other provinces, if agreeable, and if they could agree as to terms, to also enter the federation. These are the bases on which the present Government was formed, and these are the bases on which the members of that Government went to the country and asked for the support of their constituents. And to bear me out in this

assertion, I have only to read the language of His Excellency the Governor General as I find it embodied in His Excellency's Speech at the close of the last session of Parliament. You will find it in the latter part of the Speech. His Excellency says:—"The time has arrived when the constitutional question, which has for many years agitated this province, is ripe for settlement." What province is alluded to in this paragraph? Most certainly the province of Canada. "It is my intention," proceeds His Excellency, "during the approaching recess, to endeavor to devise a plan for this purpose, which will be laid before Parliament at its next meeting." Hon. gentlemen, where is that plan? Where is the measure so promised in the Speech from the Throne. "In releasing you from further attendance," His Excellency goes on to say, "I would impress upon you the importance of using the influence which the confidence of your fellow subjects confers upon you to secure for any scheme which may be prepared with this object a calm and impartial consideration both in Parliament and throughout the country." Now, what does this mean? If it means anything, it means this, that the Government promised to bring down a measure to this Legislature to enable us to confederate Upper and Lower Canada. "Well," hon. gentlemen say, "they have brought down a larger scheme." Yes, but who asked them to bring down that scheme? It is said that it makes no difference which scheme was laid before the House; but I contend that it makes all the difference, for if these resolutions had reference simply to Upper and Lower Canada, they would be susceptible of amendment by this House. In such a case, hon. gentlemen would not have come down as we now see them shaking their resolutions in the face of the members of the Legislature, and saying, "Here is a treaty which you must accept in its entirety or not at all." They would not be warning as at our peril to alter a word or erase a line on pain of being branded as disunionists or perhaps something worse than that. Had they brought down the resolutions they were pledged to bring down, we would be sitting here calmly and dispassionately, aided by the Government of the day, framing a measure which would be in very deed for the benefit of the two provinces. But why do the Government seek to shelter themselves so completely behind these resolu-

tions—resolutions which, as they stand, are incapable of justification — resolutions which shew concession after concession to have been made to the eastern provinces, but not one of which (I challenge them to the proof) was made by the Lower Provinces to the people of Canada? Then look at the representation at the Conference. Both parties, I believe, from all the provinces were represented, except as regards one section of Canada. There was no one representing in the Conference the liberal party in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) While in the eastern provinces the Government of the day were magnanimous enough to ask the co-operation and consideration of the leaders of the Opposition in those provinces, the hon. gentlemen in Canada ignored entirely the existence of the liberal party in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend from the Erie Division tells us that he is strongly opposed to the details of the scheme.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I did not say so. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I stated in reference to the elective principle that I was opposed to its abrogation.

HON. MR. CURRIE—If the hon. gentleman feels towards the elective principle as strongly as I do, he will oppose its abrogation to the last. I have reason to feel strongly in regard to that principle, being, like himself, indebted for it to a seat in the Legislature; and I will resist the measure very long before I vote against a principle giving the people power to send me here as their representative. The hon. gentlemen also told us that the whole country is in favor of Federation. I have no doubt the whole country is in favor of Federation in itself, but there are many people throughout Canada who are opposed to the present scheme on account of its details. Then the hon. gentleman declared that the country understood the scheme. Now, what better illustration can we have of the falsity of this position than what was witnessed on the floor of this House last night? We then heard one of the most intelligent and one of the most able members of the mercantile community in Upper Canada, my hon. friend from the Ottawa Division (Hon. Mr. SKEAD) tell us it was only within the last 24 hours that he had understood the scheme as now submitted to the House. And yet we are gravely told that the whole country understands it! Do the people of the province generally know anything in reference

to the cost of working the scheme? Hon. gentlemen, it has been stated in various parts of the country, by leading public men of the country, that the local subsidies proposed in the scheme will be more than sufficient to carry on the local governments of the several provinces. But, hon. gentlemen, we must judge of the future by the experience afforded by the past. If you will look at the Public Accounts of Upper and Lower Canada—take for instance Upper Canada in 1838,—you will find that the expenditure on 450,000 of a population was \$885,000 for one year. But, hon. gentlemen may assert that at that time Upper Canada had to bear the the burdens of the militia and pay the cost of collecting the customs, and some other small charges which it is now proposed to throw on the Federal Government. But what were the charges of the militia for that year? The insignificant sum of £649. 19s. 11½d. Then there was received from fees and commission £317 15s., thus making the total cost of the militia to Upper Canada no more than £332. 4s. 11½d. Then as to customs. Why, honorable gentlemen, the whole cost of collecting the customs revenue in Upper Canada, during the year 1838, amounted to £2,792. 14s. 2d.—just about one half the cost, hardly one half the cost—of collecting the present duties at the port of Toronto. Then if you come down to Lower Canada you will find that at the time of the union you had a population of 650,000 souls, and that the expense of governing the people was \$573,348. And I venture to say that no people in the world were ever more cheaply governed than were the people of Lower Canada before the union. (Hear, hear.) But if you can govern them after the union just as cheaply per head as before, what do you find? You will require \$980,000 to carry on the government of the country, independent of paying the interest upon the large portion of debt saddled upon you. In Upper Canada, we have been told that we really shall not know what to do with the large amount of money about to be lavished on the Local Legislature. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. McCREA—Who said that—that we would have more money than we know what to do with?

HON. MR. CURRIE—You must have read it in the speeches made in the other House, and particularly in the speeches of the Hon. Mr. BROWN. Well, if we can govern the people of Upper Canada as cheap-

govern the people of Upper Canada as cheaply after the union as before, it will cost \$2,170,000 or \$1,054,000 more than the amount of the local subsidy. I am sure no hon. gentleman will believe that we are going to be more saving of the public money in the future than we were in those early days of our history. Hon. gentlemen, it is said that the people of the country have had those resolutions before them, that they perfectly understand them, and that they are prepared to pass a dispassionate judgment in the matter. It ill becomes the members of the Government to make such a statement. Why, what has been witnessed on the floor of this House? A simple question was put to the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands as to the manner in which the members of the Legislative Councils of the various provinces were to be appointed. The Hon. Commissioner informed us that the appointment was to be made by local governments, and he was confirmed in that view by the hon. and gallant Premier, who had the dignity conferred upon him of presiding over the Conference of delegates held in this city.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I do not think that my hon. colleague said anything on the subject.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I understood him to confirm the statement of the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands. But at all events, he heard the statement and did not object to it. But what did you find? After the absurdity of that position was pointed out, my hon. friend, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, asks a day to give an answer to the question, and he comes down next day and gives a totally different reply. A few days later, the question of the export duty on the minerals of Nova Scotia came under consideration, and I understood the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands as saying that in his opinion the coals and minerals exported to foreign countries would be liable to duty. But according to the explanations given by the hon. gentleman afterwards, I understand that the export duty will apply to all coals and minerals exported from Nova Scotia. My hon. friend went on to explain the meaning of this export duty. And what is his explanation? He tells us that it is nothing more than a royalty. The export duty is imposed simply upon the coals which leave the country. In Nova Scotia they now impose a royalty, and that royalty they intend to change for an

export duty, and the difference in their favor will be this—that on the coals they consume themselves there will be no duty, but on the coals they send to Canada there will be this barrier of an export duty.

HON. MR. ROSS—My hon. friend will see this, that had all the Crown lands in the different colonies been placed in the hands of the General Government, the General Government would have received all the proceeds therefrom. But those have been given to the local governments, and as in Upper Canada we will have timber dues, so in Nova Scotia they are entitled to a revenue from their coals.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Any one not acquainted with the subject would naturally fancy from the language of my hon. friend that under Federation we are to have something which we did not possess before. But the Crown lands are the property of Upper and Lower Canada now, and we are entitled to the revenue from them.

HON. MR. ROSS—And so is Nova Scotia entitled to a revenue from their coal.

HON. MR. CURRIE—But you give them a privilege not accorded in the other provinces of imposing export duties. Hon. gentlemen, I would now desire to allude to another matter which I think the people do not thoroughly understand, and that is the apportionment of the public debt. I stated before and I again assert that revenue is the only true basis on which the people should go into Confederation as regards their debt; and I think my hon. friend from the Saugeen Division (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON) saw the matter in the same light.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—Not in this case, because we have not the revenue to base it upon.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Why have we not the revenue to base it upon? Hon. gentlemen, the Trade Returns of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, are in the Library below, and twenty-four hours' work of a competent accountant would shew what each province would contribute to the general revenue from her trade under our present tariff.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—But does not the hon. gentleman see that when the tariffs are assimilated, they will not bring in the future what they have brought in the past?

HON. MR. CURRIE—This I can see, that you are giving to the Lower Provinces privileges which we do not enjoy. Hon. gen-

tle men speak of the imports from the Maritime Provinces. But take the import of coals from Nova Scotia, and we find that in 1863, its whole value amounted to \$67,000. Then they refer to the fish trade. But why need we go there for fish, when in our own waters we can have for the catching as fine fish as the world produces? But Confederation will give us no privileges over the fisheries which we do not at present enjoy. Canadian fishermen can as well go, and have as much the right to go, and fish in the waters below before as after Confederation. We will continue to go there if we desire it, not because we are members of the Confederacy, but because we are British subjects. But I was going to speak of the trade of these countries. We derive now little or no duty from the trade of the Lower Provinces, at the same time much of the revenues of the Lower Provinces is derived from exports from those provinces to each other, all of which will be lost to the General Government, as the Confederation will only be entitled to collect duties in goods imported from foreign countries. We are told, too, that our tariff is to be greatly reduced under Confederation. I am sorry to hear that statement, because it is impossible that it can be correct, and there is too much reason to fear that it was done with a view of influencing legislation elsewhere, by holding out the hope in Newfoundland and in the other provinces, that if they joined us, the tariff would be less burdensome than it is at present. But if the tariff is reduced, the people of Canada may rest assured that they will have \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 to raise in some other way; so that if you take it off the tariff, you must put it on the land. I wish now, however, to speak of the unfair apportionment of the debt. I have always taken the ground that revenue is the true gauge by which you can measure a nation's ability to pay debt. Well, taking the tables of the Finance Minister, we find that New Brunswick, with a revenue of \$1,000,000, goes into the Confederation with a debt of \$7,000,000, while Canada, with a revenue of \$11,500,000, is only entitled to go into the Confederation with a debt of \$62,500,000. Is this fair?—is it right?—is it honest? Taking the revenue as the basis of ability to pay—and it is the only true basis—and instead of Canada going into the Confederation with a debt only \$62,500,000, she would be entitled to go in with a deb-

of \$80,000,000, or more than her present indebtedness. Then it is said that the people understand the whole scheme, and that they are perfectly satisfied with it. If that were so we should have petitions coming down. But I have yet to learn that when the people, especially of Upper Canada, understand the scheme and how it is going to work, that they will be at all satisfied with it. Take the little Island of Prince Edward, with its population of 80,857 souls, or a less population than a single constituency represented in the other branch of the Legislature, and we find it getting \$153,723, while it is relieved of a debt of \$240,633.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And what does it contribute?

HON. MR. CURRIE—It simply contributes custom and excise duties by the operation of the same tariff and under the same law as the people of Canada.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—But how much does it contribute?

HON. MR. CURRIE—I find the whole revenue of the island set down at \$200,000. But, hon. gentlemen, pray do not run away with the idea that all this comes to the Confederate Government. All that comes to the Confederate Government are simply the duties from excise and customs on goods imported from foreign countries.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Which is the whole amount of their revenue, except \$31,000.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Surely my hon. friend does not wish to get up and argue that the people of this little island—a frugal and industrious people—contribute more to the revenue per head than the people of Upper Canada? Well, let us proceed now to Newfoundland, and what do we find? That with a population of 122,600 souls—less than the population of Huron, Bruce and Grey—less, in fact, than the constituency represented by my hon. friend, the member for Saugeen—they get \$369,000 a year for all time, and are relieved of a debt of \$946,000.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And what do they contribute?

HON. MR. CURRIE—Simply the revenue from customs and excise, and nothing more.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And what does that amount to?

HON. MR. CURRIE—I am aware that—

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—They will contribute, under the present tariff, \$479,000 per annum.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend surely does not intend to say that Newfoundland has no other source of revenue than customs and excise.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—No other ; and that is the reason why they get \$150,000.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Newfoundland is to have \$106,000 a year, not for this year only, but for all time to come. She gets as well 80 cents per head for all time to come. Then she gets also, what I am sure the Commissioner of Crown Lands can hardly justify, that is a bonus of \$165,000 for all time to come ; and this, if *capitalized*, amounts to \$3,000,000—and all this that she may come into the Confederation. And why does she receive so large a sum ? My hon. friend tells us that she gets it in consideration of the valuable crown lands and minerals which she surrenders to the General Government. But we have yet to learn as a matter of fact that a ton of coals has ever been raised in the island. And what other minerals have they ? We know of none. Their Crown lands, too, are of no value, as is proved by their not having yielded anything at all for many years past. Then why should we give them \$3,000,000, or \$165,000 per year for worthless lands ? I will not say, however, that they are altogether worthless ; but I know this, that for years past a statute has been in force, giving the lands free of charge to anybody who will go and settle on them for five years. And these are the valuable lands for which we are to pay an equivalent of \$3,000,000. But my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, perhaps, when he addresses the House, will tell us these Crown lands and minerals, whatever their value to Newfoundland, are worth \$3,000,000 to the Confederation, and will argue as that they give up these lands and minerals, and have no local source of revenue, it is necessary, they should receive this subsidy in return. But why have they no local source of revenue ? Why not adopt the same means to raise revenue in Newfoundland that we adopt here ? Why should we be called upon to contribute from the public chest \$165,000 for a purpose that we in Canada tax ourselves for ? Hon. gentlemen, I stated that the country was taken by surprise in regard to the manner in which this measure was brought down to the House ; and I think I have good reason for making that statement. Before we came here we had

very little explanation of the financial part of the scheme ; and that is a most important part. I am not one of those who, while favorable to Confederation as a principle, would put a few hundred thousand dollars in the scale against it. But my grounds against the scheme are these — that if it is commenced upon a basis which is unjust to one portion of the community, it will be based upon a false foundation, and the tenement thus proposed to be erected will not withstand the breath of public opinion. We had reason to suppose that when we came here the measure promised at the close of the last session would be submitted ; but instead of that we have a very different measure altogether. But supposing this Address passes — supposing these resolutions are carried, and the other colonies do not concur in the same Address as ourselves, what is to be the consequence ? As I understand it, the consent of all the provinces must be had, and if they do not concur, the scheme falls to the ground. What we ought to have had in Canada was the promised measure to put an end to the sectional difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. But instead of that, we are placed in consequence of the Quebec Conference in this position—a scheme is brought down which is declared to be in the nature of a treaty, and we are told that we are to have no voice in its alteration. No matter what the details may be—our discussion of them is to be a mere farce. Even the reasonable delay I am now asking for will, I fear, be opposed by the Government of the day. Hon. gentlemen, in order to shew the necessity which exists for the measure being equitable and just to all classes of the people and all sections of the country about to be affected by it, I will read the remarks of a distinguished statesman—one of the ablest men, perhaps, that Canada can claim. This is his language :—

No measure could possibly meet the approval of the people of Canada which contained within it the germs of injustice to any, and if, in the measure which was now before the people of Canada, there was anything which bore on its face injustice, it would operate greatly against the success of the measure itself.

These were the views of the Minister of Finance as expressed by him only a few months ago, and it is because I feel that there are parts of the scheme which will do

gross and wanton injustice to portions of the proposed Confederation, that I feel it to be my duty to oppose it. It may be said that it is not proper for this branch of the Legislature to delay the measure, but I quite concur, on this point, in the views of the hon. gentleman who represents one of the largest and most important constituencies in Canada (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON), when he said—

Although the Legislative Council is precluded by this constitution from originating money votes or making money appropriations of any kind, they have it nevertheless in their power zealously to guard your interests, protecting them against hasty and ill-considered legislation, and preventing improper and extravagant appropriations of the public funds.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I approve of all that.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I fully concur in all the hon. member from Saugeen stated in his address to his constituents, with reference to this subject, and I hope the hon. gentleman will now, when the opportunity is offered him, act up to the professions he made, and I feel confident he will do so. Now, hon. gentlemen, what have we here before us? We have a scheme which is calculated to do manifest and untold injustice to that section of the province which the hon. gentleman has the honor to represent. We have a scheme pledging us to construct the Intercolonial Railway without our knowing whether it is to cost fifteen, twenty or thirty millions of dollars. The only estimate is that alluded to by the hon. member from Toronto who stated that Mr. BRYDGES was prepared to build it for seventeen and a half millions of dollars.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—This House has nothing to do with money matters.

HON. MR. CURRIE—If my hon. friend entertains that opinion, he will very soon learn a very different and important lesson respecting the privileges of this House. It is our duty as honest legislators to protect the country from the baneful effects of hasty and ill-considered legislation. Well, is not this hasty legislation that was now proposed to be transacted by the Government of the day?

HON. MR. MACPHERSON.—I do not regard it so, and I tell you why. My constituents have considered the question and are fully satisfied that the proposed legislation should take place.

HON. MR. CURRIE—It has been said by hon. gentlemen that the whole scheme consists of concessions. I would ask what concessions had been made to Canada? What concession has been made to the views of the people of Upper Canada? The people will understand why it is that everything was conceded on the part of Canada, and comparatively nothing on the part of the Lower Provinces, when they know that the little colony of Prince Edward Island, with its eighty thousand people, has as much to say in the Conference as Upper Canada with its million and a half, and as Lower Canada with its million and a quarter, of people. (Hear, hear.) When we conceded to them that point, the series of concessions on the part of Canada began. Then we conceded to them the right of depriving us of an elective Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.) Who challenges this statement? I defy any hon. gentlemen to say that it was not at the dictation of the eastern provinces, that the character of the Legislative Council was changed. In order to settle this point, it is only necessary to refer hon. gentlemen to what the Hon. Minister of Finance stated in his celebrated Sherbrooke speech with reference to it. That was concession number two. Then look at the proposed Constitution. The Lower Provinces had only a population of 700,000 of people. One would think they would be satisfied with the same representation in the Legislative Council that Upper Canada with double the number of people should have, and that Lower Canada with nearly double the population should be given. But instead of being satisfied with 24, they must have 28 members. There are three distinct and most important concessions on the part of Canada to the people of the eastern provinces. And then we go into the Federation with a debt of only \$62,500,000, instead of with \$82,500,000 as we were entitled to. Then we are to saddle ourselves with a burden of \$15,000,000, and give them a bonus for coming in, in the shape of an annual payment for local purposes, which we defray in Upper Canada by direct taxation.

HON. MR. McCREA—That is because they are to help to pay our debt.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My honorable friend from the Western Division says, they have to help to pay our debt; true they have to help to pay the debts of the Confederation, but that is no reason why they should receive

money from us to pay their local expenses. Then look at the absurdity of giving each province so much per head on its population for the expenses of the local governments. Every one knows that the population of the Lower Provinces will not increase nearly so fast as that of this province. We will therefore have to pay a greater proportion of this amount through the increase of our population than we can receive under the proposed arrangement. This is concession number four. The next concession is to New Brunswick. We are to give New Brunswick a bonus of \$630,000 in addition to building the Intercolonial Railway through a long section of the country—leading the people to believe that the road is to pass through nearly every town in the province. Then Nova Scotia gets the right to impose an export duty on its coals and other minerals coming into Upper Canada, or going elsewhere. Then Newfoundland, as I have said before, is to have upward of three millions of dollars, if you capitalize the annual gift, as an inducement to come in and join us. Then, hon. gentlemen, my hon. friend from Port Hope spoke of the common schools of Canada, of about one million and quarter of dollars that is to be abolished by a stroke of the pen—that is another concession, I suppose, made to the people of the eastern provinces. What do we get for all these concessions? Do we get anything that we are not entitled to as a matter of right. We get 17 additional members of the Lower House for Upper Canada, but that is nothing more than we are entitled to, at the same time we get 47 added from the east. We are told that the reason for having so large a number of members is to avoid narrow majorities. If everything works well, therefore, under the new constitution, we are told we will always have a strong Government, somewhat similar to that with which we are now blessed. Hon. gentlemen say, that this question is perfectly understood by the people of Canada, and that they are satisfied with the arrangement; then what danger, I would ask, can there be in allowing the people a few months to consider the matter still more fully. In my opinion, it is far better to take the thing up deliberately and proceed cautiously with it, than to attempt to force, so hurriedly, a measure upon the people that they will feel hereafter, if they do not now, that you are doing them a very great injustice. (Hear,

hear.) It is most extraordinary, the grounds on which these resolutions are supported by different classes of people. Some hon. gentlemen support them on the ground that the Confederation is to build up an independent nationality in this part of the world. Others, on the ground that it is going to cement us more closely as colonies. And a third party uphold the resolutions on the ground that the injustice of the thing will disgust the people and float our country over to the American Republic. I feel, myself, that unless the people have due time to consider the matter, and are not driven into it against their will, these resolutions will amount to nothing more than so many withes to tie the provinces together until we all drift like a raft into the American Confederation. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

—o—

*Friday, February 17, 1865.*

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands is right in supposing that I am opposed to Federation. I am opposed to it, and particularly on the basis agreed upon at the Quebec Convention. I do not say that I would be opposed to a legislative union on fair and equal terms; but I am decidedly opposed to Federation on the terms now before the House. My hon. friend has said that in all unions there must be forbearance; but in this Federation scheme it appears to me the forbearance has been all on one side. The forbearance has not been mutual. When parties enter into a partnership, there ought to be forbearance on the part of each, and mutual concessions. But in this case the concessions as well as the forbearance have been all on the side of Canada. My hon. friend, with all his eloquence and ability, has not answered a single objection raised by my hon. friend from Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE). He has found it convenient to pass them all over for the simple reason that he found them unanswerable. My hon. friend says:—"Was not the French language restored to Lower Canada, and was not this a change in the constitution?" Hon. gentlemen, it was certainly restored, and by the conservative administration of that day, and, as my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. BOULTON) has said, unanimously. There was no opposition, for it was considered a

right to which our French Canadian fellow-subjects were fully entitled. But is the restoration of the French language to be compared with the resolution now proposed — with the great constitutional change which is intended to affect, not only ourselves, but our children and our children's children for all time to come? Is a change like this to be compared with the restoration of the French language? Certainly not. It seems to me to be the most extraordinary comparison I ever heard of. Then my hon. friend has referred to the change in the constitution of the Legislative Council. But was not that question over and over again before the people? Did not the people at the hustings frequently pronounce an opinion upon that change? Undoubtedly they did, and it being understood that the people were in favor of it, the change was brought about. My hon. friend says that in the Conference they were surrounded with difficulties. No doubt they were. And why? Because they allowed for Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland as many delegates as they did for Canada. No doubt they were surrounded with difficulties. No doubt they were overwhelmed by the demands of these gentlemen. The hon. gentleman says that Confederation is necessary to strengthen the defences of the country. In what way? Can any hon. gentleman tell me in what way? I have not heard one word to prove, to my satisfaction, how the defences of the country are to be strengthened by Federation, unless indeed it be by placing the whole of the provinces under one head. Why, hon. gentlemen, did I not shew here the other day what was the feeling of the Lower Provinces in regard to the defences of the country? At a time when our Parliament were proposing to pass an act which would entail the expenditure of millions on the defences of the country, what was being done in the Lower Provinces? Why the financial secretary of one of the provinces came down with a proposed grant of \$20,000, and he was obliged to apologize to the House that the sum was so large! And the present Premier of Nova Scotia—a province second in importance in British North America—proposed to strike off \$12,000, and leave the appropriation at \$8,000. This was proposed by a province next in importance to our own, and at the time of the *Trent* affair, when there was an appearance of danger much greater than at present. And what did New Brunswick do?

Appropriate \$15,000. The people that did all this are the people to whom we are to ally ourselves that we may be strengthened in our efforts for the defence of the country! Do hon. gentlemen believe that an alliance with provinces whose leading men hold such views as these would add to our strength? Certainly not. My hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands has also said that 95 out of every 100 of the people of Upper Canada are in favor of Federation. My hon. friend is mistaken. I once had the honor of representing a portion of his constituents, and I would inform my hon. friend that I know as much of the feeling, not simply of the people of Upper Canada, speaking of them generally, but of his constituents, as he does: and this I would say that were my hon. friend to go before his constituents and tell them that in order to get Federation, Upper Canada is to pay two-thirds of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, and two-thirds of the cost of maintenance of the road for all time to come, and that the roads of the Lower Provinces are to be made Government roads, and to be kept up in future at the expense of Federal Government, and that Upper Canada will have two-thirds of the burden to bear, I will venture to say that my hon. friend would find himself wrong in his estimate of being able to satisfy 95 out of every 100 of his constituents.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Tell them of all the circumstances, and I would be able to satisfy them.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friend is greatly mistaken. If my hon. friend is to be one of the life members under the Federation, he would not require so much to satisfy them.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is altogether too fast. I do not look forward to any such thing.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friend has the power in his hands; but if he does not desire the honor, of course he can avoid its being thrust upon him. But my hon. friend could not for a moment go before his constituents—and he represents a constituency which for intelligence is second to none in Upper Canada—and tell them that they are to contribute to the revenue of the Confederation in proportion to their import duties—that they are to contribute according to their wealth—and that they are only to receive back in proportion to their population—that largely as they contribute, the

return will only be the same as to the fishermen and lumberers who form the floating population of the Lower Provinces, and carry so large a majority as he has named with him. A doctrine such as this is any thing but conservatives. I would submit to any thing rather than vote for such a scheme. Were I to support it in its present shape I should consider myself as betraying the witness of my country. Hon. gentlemen are of course entitled to their own opinions in this matter; but these are mine, and I shall continue to maintain and uphold them. I assert that the amendment of my hon. friend for delay is a just and reasonable one, and I cannot see how it can possibly be objected to in a matter of this importance, where the dearest interests of the whole country are at stake, and where we are legislating not for ourselves alone but for future generations. Such being the importance of the measure, I cannot conceive how hon. gentlemen can vote against so reasonable a proposition. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—I seek for information from the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, as to the scheme respecting the local legislatures. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that it would not be submitted to the present Parliament?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It is so intended.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—I also understood my hon. friend to say that before the House pronounced upon the general scheme of Federation, it would not be proper to submit the scheme for the local legislatures. I cannot see the force of that. But still I will not raise that as an objection to proceeding with the present scheme.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Perhaps my hon. friend from Brock is right in the view he takes. But it was thought by the Government that it would be premature to bring in the scheme for the local governments until it was seen whether Parliament was in favor of these resolutions.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—But many members of this House, before making of their minds as to how they ought to vote on the resolutions, would like to be informed as to the nature of the local scheme, which is to have such an important bearing on the question at issue.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The Parliament

of the country will have the fullest opportunity of pronouncing upon it.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—When?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—After these resolutions have been passed. We thought it was unnecessary for us to give our attention to the local constitutions for Upper and Lower Canada until we had ascertained whether Parliament was in favor of Federation. That ascertained, we shall feel it our duty to give our minds to the preparation of the scheme for the constitutions of the two provinces; and these constitutions will be laid before Parliament.

HON. MR. ROSS—I do not know what the views of the Government may be upon this point, but it seems to me that it would have been an extraordinary proceeding had they brought down at this juncture the proposed constitutions for Upper and Lower Canada. There may be a great difference of opinion arise as to the constitutions proper to be proposed for these provinces; and it is quite possible that these differences may occasion the withdrawal of some members of the Government. (Cries of "hear, hear.") Hon. gentlemen cry "hear, hear." But I say that such may possibly be the case. And it would be absurd and impolitic for the Government to throw the country in a state of confusion as regards the scheme for the local legislatures if they failed in carrying the resolutions here submitted. Hon. gentlemen will see that they would be unworthy of the position they hold were they to do so. I am not sure whether I understood my hon. friend to say that the scheme for the local legislatures would be brought down on the passing of these resolutions. I hope that I misunderstood him, because I think we should wait the result of the action of the Lower Provinces. We should see if Federation succeeds there, inasmuch as in case of its failure in the Lower Provinces, even if we adopt the resolutions here, the arrangement would not go into effect, and we would be placing the country in a state of turmoil and confusion in discussing measures which would be altogether unnecessary. We ought, it seems to me, first to carry out this arrangement as far as it is possible to carry it, and if we can secure the assent to it of the two larger provinces below, there will be a reasonable certainty of the scheme being effected. And then, and not till then will the proper time arrive for the discussions of the proposed

---

Constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada. I am perfectly amazed at the proposition of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. FERGUSON BLAIR), because he is friendly to these resolutions, and gave us the expression of his views thereon in an admirable manner at the opening of the debate. I say that the hon. gentleman should desire to have the scheme for the local legislatures *quoad* this project is beyond my comprehension.

HON. MR. FERGUSON BLAIR— I think it is only reasonable that as hon. gentlemen argue, they should see before voting for or against Federation what are the proposed constitutions for the local legislatures. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL— My hon. friend should add this to the reflection—that at all events hon. members will have a full opportunity of pronouncing upon it.