

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 member for Saugeen Division, (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON), 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 principle 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 \$68,000 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