

MR. PAQUET—I shall now submit to this honorable House a statement of the expenditure which will be incurred by the Government of Lower Canada :—

Administration of justice.....	\$364,785
Deducting the salaries of the judges..	50,000
	\$314,785
Education.....	254,000
Scientific institutions.....	5,900
Hospitals and charities.....	124,949
Board of Arts and Manufactures.....	3,500
Agriculture.....	50,000
Repairs and public buildings.....	15,000
Colonization and roads.....	113,000
Timber cullers.....	35,000
Office and other contingencies.....	77,000
Public works.....	30,000
Slides.....	15,000
Surveys.....	30,000
Court houses and gaols.....	10,500
Rent of site of Parliament house....	4,444
Legislation.....	200,000
Executive Government.....	100,000
Public departments.....	100,000
Public lands.....	37,000
Publication of the laws.....	20,000
Elections.....	15,000
River police.....	30,000
Unforeseen expenditure.....	10,000
Interest on the Federal debt, share of Lower Canada.....	300,000
Total expenditure.....	\$1,885,078
Local revenue estimated at about....	1,400,000
Deficit.....	\$485,078

These figures are taken from the Public Accounts for last year. Subtracting from that sum the estimated amount of the revenue of the Local Government, instead of a surplus there will be a deficit of \$485,088; and I ask you, MR. SPEAKER, how are we to meet it otherwise than by direct taxation, or by diminishing the public appropriations, which are by no means excessive now? (Hear, hear.) If we do not adopt the latter alternative, there will remain, I say, no other means than direct taxation. The Hon. Minister of Finance, moreover, told us so expressly, in these words :—

The Federal Legislature will have power to impose any system of duties which they may think proper to meet the expenses of its administration, whilst the local legislatures will be obliged to have recourse to direct taxation for the same purpose, if their revenues prove insufficient.

For my part, MR. SPEAKER, I affirm that

the country is not ready to submit to such a state of things, and in this matter, as also upon the scheme itself, I am quite certain that I express the opinion of my country. (Hear, hear.) A third point, which I would humbly submit for the consideration of the House, is the expediency of pressing for the adoption of this measure before an appeal has been had to the people. I believe and I hope that the House will have too much respect for itself and for the people to vote at once upon the resolutions now submitted to us. If, however, public opinion is not to be regarded, I flatter myself that at all events precedents will not be treated with contempt. We find in the *History of Canada*, by CHRISTIE, that in 1823, when a proposition was made in the Lower Canadian Parliament to effect changes in the Constitution, the following decision was come to by the Government of Lower Canada, and the paragraph I am about to read formed part of the Speech from the Throne :—

I am commanded to inform you that His Majesty's Ministers proposed to Parliament certain alterations in the act thirty-first George the Third, chapter thirty-one, principally with a view to unite into one the two legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada; but the measure was withdrawn and postponed to the next session, in order to afford an opportunity of ascertaining the sentiments of the people of those provinces upon it.

(Hear, hear). In the same history we find another example, which will, I believe, strongly support me in the position I have taken :—

In 1839 Lord JOHN RUSSELL gave notice in the House of Commons, on the 3rd June, of certain resolutions which he intended to submit relating to the projected union of the Canadas. He was, however, induced, on the suggestion of Sir ROBERT PEEL, to waive them, and at once to introduce his bill for the purpose. In doing which he stated it to be his intention to carry it only through a second reading, in order that it might undergo discussion, but that having received a strong protest, on the part of Upper Canada, against the intended union, he did not deem it advisable to legislate that session finally on the subject.

Here we have another fact which proves that in England, in 1839, the measure was opposed at its second reading, and that a year was given to the Canadian people to reflect upon the merits of the proposed union of the two Canadas. (Hear, hear.) I trust then, MR. SPEAKER, that what was done in 1839 will again be done in relation to the