

sum. There can be nothing unfair in the application of such a principle as that. Of course the interest on the debt, whatever it may be, must be met by taxation. "And," says my honorable friend, "the Lower Provinces are less able to pay taxation than we are, and therefore the great bulk of the taxation will have to come out of the inhabitants of Upper and Lower Canada, and particularly the merchants of the city of Montreal." Well, sir, is not this just? Is it not fair that the richest portion of the community should pay the most taxes? Does my honorable friend mean to say that those who consume most ought not to pay most to the revenue? And if the people of Upper and Lower Canada are larger consumers than the people of the Lower Provinces, ought they not to contribute according to their consumption to the revenue? "But, oh," says my honorable friend, "the people of the Lower Provinces get their 80 cents per head, and we get no more, although we are much larger contributors to the revenue." And, he adds, "the amount to be derived from the contributions to the revenue by the Lower Provinces will be very infinitesimal." But granted, for argument's sake, that this is so, I think we ought not to undervalue in this discussion the collateral advantage which the control of the fisheries will give to the united government in the union to be formed. Remember that these fisheries will form an important part in the future negotiations with the United States in reference to reciprocity, which Upper Canada attaches so much importance to. Hence Canada in this union will have the control of the policy in regard to the concession of fishing rights to the American Government. And it is in this respect that the future commercial position of the Upper Canada farmer and the Lower Canada merchant will be enhanced by the fact that the concession of the fisheries will procure for them advantages in other branches of trade; for I repeat that the future policy will be directed in a great measure by the influence wielded by Canada in the Confederation.—(Hear, hear.) My honorable friend, however, goes on to say, "But you are about to incur a large amount of debt. Lower Canada entered into the present union with a debt of only \$300,000 or \$400,000, and the united debt of the two provinces is now \$67,000,000." Well, sir, this is quite true. But Lower Canada, when she entered the union, had only a population of 600,000, and Upper Canada a population of 400,000. There was not at

that time a mile of railway; now there are upwards of 2,000. (Hear, hear.) There was hardly a light-house, and see how the St. Lawrence and lakes are lighted now from Lake Superior to Belleisle. (Hear, hear.) She went into the union without a canal, and she has now the finest canal system in the world. (Hear, hear.) She had no educational system, and look at the state of education among us at the present time. (Hear, hear.) She was without a municipal system, and look at the municipal institutions of Lower Canada as they are to be found to-day. (Hear, hear.) She went into the union with the seigniorial tenure grinding as it were the people, and weighing down the industry and enterprise of the country; and has not the seigniorial tenure been abolished? (Hear, hear.) Does not my honorable friend see the advantages of all these reforms and improvements? And does not my honorable friend know that of the \$62,000,000 which is regarded as Canada's proportion of the joint debt, \$49,000,000 and more have been actually expended in and are now positively represented by public works of that value?

HON. MR. DORION—Not in Lower Canada.

HON. MR. ROSE—My honorable friend says "Not in Lower Canada." But does he not see that the chain of canals which have been constructed to bring down the trade of the West to Montreal and Quebec, is a benefit of the most substantial kind to Lower Canada? (Hear, hear.) What but these very facilities have increased the shipping of Montreal some five hundred per cent. within the last few years. Does my honorable friend mean to say that the connection of the Grand Trunk with the western railways of the United States is not a benefit to Lower Canada? Does he mean to assert that the slides constructed on the Ottawa so as to bring lumber to Quebec is of no advantage to Lower Canada? Surely he does not measure everything that is done in the way of improvement by a petty, narrow, sectional standard, which would exact that unless a pound of money laid out in a particular spot or locality benefited that particular place, it was thrown away. Is this the policy which he would like to see introduced into the new régime?

HON. MR. CARTIER—We have, too, the Victoria Bridge.

HON. MR. ROSE—Yes, we have also the Victoria Bridge. And does my honorable friend think that we would have had this