code and civil rights, for upon marriage depends the settlement of family interests and successions, and the civil condition of the population. If the right of legislating on all matters connected with marriage is left to the Federal Parliament, it will have the right to declare that a marriage contracted elsewhere will be valid in the Confederacy, provided it has been contracted in accordance with the laws of the country in which it took place, as stated by the Honorable Solicitor General East, for it is a principle of international law perfectly understood in every country of the civilized world, and which it would be impossible to alter, and it was of no use whatever to insert it in the Constitution. I say, then, that not only will the Federal Government have this power, but they will also be able to change the civil conditions of marriage which now constitute a part of our code. But if it is sought to remove from the local legislatures the right of legislating respecting the conditions under which a marriage may be contracted, the age at which marriage is to be allowed, the degree of relationship which shall be an impediment to marriage, the consent of the relations, and the requisite dispensations which are now required to be obtained from the ecclesiastical authorities, then I can understand why this article has been inserted in the resolutions, and that the right to do all this is to be vested in the Federal Parliament. If it is desired that a minor should be allowed to marry, as he can in countries in which the laws of England prevail, without the consent of his relations, I can conceive the reason for placing the right to legislate respecting marriage in the hands of the Federal power; but if that was not the object in view, I see no reason why the right to legislate on this subject has not been left to the local governments. (Hear, hear.) I should see with considerable apprehension and alarm this power given to the General Parliament, because it will be composed of men who have ideas entirely at variance with ours in relation to marriage. As regards the question of divorce, we have had every kind of explanation as to the meaning of the resolution of the Conference. The Honorable Solicitor General of Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN), who last year made so great a fuss because a divorce suit came before the House, and who even moved the rejection of the bill at its first reading, has been brought to terms on the subject, and has discovered that it would be a good thing to have an authority for the settlement of this matter. Last year he said that it was impossible for a Catholic to sanction even the first reading of a divorce bill, and he made us a long speech on the subject, but he has found out his mistake, and he is unwilling that the local legislature should legislate on divorce, but he vests this right in the Federal Parliament, and authorizes it to do so. He cannot himself legislate, but he allows another to do so for him. Well, I do not think that this is any improvement on the existing state of things, and I think that divorce is more likely to be prevented by leaving the subject among the functions of the local legislatures, at all events as far as Lower Canada is concerned, than by leaving it to the Federal Parliament. But I go further, and I say that the leaving of this question to the Federal Legislature is to introduce divorce among the Catholics. It is certain that at present no Catholic could obtain a divorce either in the present House or from the Local Legislature of Lower Canada under Confederation. But suppose that the Federal Parliament were to enact that there shall be divorce courts in each section of the province, the Catholics will have the same access to them as the Protestants. And who is to prevent the Federal Legislature from establishing a tribunal of this kind in Lower Canada, if they are established elsewhere? In that case—if tribunals of this kind are established—will not the Honorable Solicitor General, if he votes for this resolution, have voted for the establishment of divorce courts over the whole country, to which Catholics and Protestants can have recourse for obtaining a divorce? That is the only conclusion it is possible to arrive at, and the legitimate consequence of the votes of those Catholics who will vote to vest this power in the Federal Parliament. (Hear, hear.) It is evident that a Catholic who thinks that he cannot vote for a Divorce bill ought not to vote indirectly for the establishment of Divorce courts, any more than to vote directly for it. The Honorable Solicitor General East told us the other day that he had recently obtained the annulment of a marriage, because the parties, being relations, had married without dispensation.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I never pretended that that was a divorce. I said that if the case of annulment of marriage to which I referred had arisen in Upper Canada, the Ecclesiastical courts might have declared the marriage null as far as the canon law was concerned, but not as regarded the civil laws, for the law of Upper Canada does not recog-