

fortunes of his country. He has long lamented, like JEREMIAH, over the thought of the disasters which were overwhelming it. And at last, in 1858, enlightened by the intelligence of his luminous friend the member for Chateauguay, he thought he had discovered in direct taxation the remedy for the evils which were bringing it to its grave. (Hear, hear.) But to-day he rejects a scheme which may save the country without its being necessary to have recourse to this extreme and objectionable remedy. (Hear, hear.) If the scheme becomes law, not only shall we have a sufficient revenue to meet our local expenditure, but we shall also have a surplus with which, if we practise wise economy, to pay off by degrees the residue of the debt which will remain to us. The hon. member for Hochelaga tells us that Lower Canada will be burthened with a local debt of more than \$4,500,000; but we have clear and palpable proof that the debt of Canada, deducting the part of the Sinking Fund which has been paid, amounts to only \$67,500,000. Now our share of the Federal debt is established at \$62,500,000. There will consequently remain less than \$5,000,000 to be divided between the two Canadas, and all the arguments of the hon. member will not change so incontestable a fact as this. (Hear, hear.) We do not get these figures from the Hon. Minister of Finance. They are given to us by a man who is perfectly independent of all Ministers and of all parties—a man whom I myself formerly reproached with being too much so; I allude to Mr. LANGTON, the Auditor of Accounts. (Hear, hear.) We do not yet know, it is true, how this debt of four millions and some hundred thousand dollars will be divided between the two Canadas, but we do know, without any possibility of doubt, that the local revenues will belong to the local governments, and that they will amply suffice for all their requirements. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Hochelaga complains that Upper Canada retains her public lands and what is owing to Government on those lands, and he maintains that Lower Canada ought to have her share of what those lands produce. But did those lands belong to us before the union, and have we not our own public lands, together with the revenue accruing from them? Have we not more lands to settle than Upper Canada? Since the discovery of our gold and copper mines the amount produced by the sale of our public

lands has increased fivefold, whilst Upper Canada has hardly any land left to sell. Let our mines be opened, and we shall find that we have no reason to envy Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) Everything is well adjusted; for if we have a less considerable revenue than Upper Canada, our population is also less numerous. Upper Canada possesses a more considerable revenue, but one which must diminish with the decrease of the quantity of land to be sold, whilst we have a revenue which is gradually increasing. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member would no doubt hand over the public lands to the Confederation so as to be in accordance with his plan of 1859, as set forth in the Montreal manifesto; but I am certain that Lower Canada does not share his opinion. He talked to us also of marriage and divorce. He said: "Now, you will not vote directly for divorce, but you vote to establish divorce courts." Well! no one condemns divorce more than I do myself, and I am convinced that the hon. member for Hochelaga would accept it sooner than I would. But if no mention was made of divorce in the Constitution, if it was not assigned to the Federal Parliament, it would of necessity belong to the local parliaments as it belongs to our Legislature now, although there is not one word respecting it in the Union Act. For my part, I would rather see that power removed to a distance from us, since it must exist somewhere in spite of us. (Hear, hear.) These reasonings on the question of marriage are extraordinary to a degree, coming from a man holding a position at the bar. They are so extraordinary, and so inconsistent with all logic and all law, that I shall not take the trouble of controverting them. The explanations of the Government have satisfied me on that point. The legislative power of the Federal Parliament in relation to marriage will only be that which is conferred by the Constitution, notwithstanding the singular assertions of the honorable member. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

On motion of Dr. PARKER, the debate was then adjourned.

—o—

TUESDAY, 7th March, 1865.

The Order of the Day being read for resuming the adjourned debate on Confederation,—