

this we were willing to take our chance whether that influence, employed in a legitimate and constitutional way, succeeded in removing our grievances or not. (Hear, hear.) To say now that we do not obtain what we have contended for—to say that we do not get representation by population because the Lower Provinces, including Lower Canada, will have thirty more votes in the General Legislature, is simply doing Upper Canada an injustice and a wrong; and the history of the British parliamentary system and our own experience in Canada, warrant the conclusion that in the General Legislature we shall not have, as alleged by honorable gentlemen opposed to the scheme, parties divided against one another because of the provinces which they represent. Under our present Constitution we are not divided sectionally, but as political parties, for we find gentlemen from both sections taking sides according to their political predilections, irrespective of sectional considerations; and so it will be under the proposed Confederation. We have conservatives and radicals, and always will have them. Do we not find men of both races in the province voting on both sides politically? It is true the demand for constitutional changes has to some extent, but only to some extent, divided us as the representatives of sections in this House; but on all other questions—such as commerce, banking, customs tariffs, excise, and other questions—we find gentlemen voting according to their political views, and not as representing sections. So it will be under the Confederation. People will be divided into parties by their political opinions and leanings, and not by sectional considerations. (Hear, hear.) In claiming, then, that under it there will, on all questions, be a majority against Upper Canada, is to assume that Upper Canada will be at war with all the other provinces, and that they will be continually at war with it. Well, what right has any man to assume that this will be the case—that Upper Canada will be the Ishmael of the Confederation? I think he has none whatever. (Hear, hear.) The addition of seventeen members to Upper Canada in the outset, with the proposed arrangement for re-adjustment every ten years according to the increase or decrease of population in each of the provinces, is substantial justice to all, and is all that Upper Canada ever asked for or expected. But, Mr. SPEAKER, the honorable member for North Ontario not only accuses the Upper Canadians who support this scheme of an

abandonment of their principles on this point, and of offering to the people of Upper Canada the very opposite of what they asked for, but charges that we have sacrificed our cash as well as our principles. An honorable member of the other House has taken similar ground, and charges in effect that the Lower Provinces have been bribed into this scheme at the expense of Upper Canada, and that as regards Lower Canada, we undertake to pay her in perpetuity a subsidy of \$167,000 a year; and the honorable gentleman asks if ever Lower Canada asked for anything like that under our present system? He tells us, too, that for each of the seventeen additional members we get in the Federal Government, we pay at the rate of \$16,000 each. As regards the Lower Provinces, I submit that it cannot be shewn that their union with us will be to our detriment in money matters. They will contribute as large an amount per head to the general revenue as we do in Upper Canada, and if any financial effect will be felt by Upper Canada in consequence of the union of these provinces with us, I think it must be in the direction of lessening her burdens; such, at all events, is the conclusion I have arrived at, and such, I think, is the conclusion any man will arrive at who will take the trouble to inform himself of the position of these provinces as regards the financial questions between Upper and Lower Canada. I do not know where the honorable member gets his figures, nor can I very well understand them, but in regard to the subsidy of \$167,000 a year that he speaks of, what are the facts of the case? Let it be borne in mind, sir, that as Upper Canadians we claimed that we were paying an enormous price for the present union with Lower Canada, and that we urged this as one reason why we were entitled to the concession of representation by population as an act of justice, that we might have our due share of influence in controlling the expenditure of the revenues of the country to which we contributed so largely. We complained, and it was advanced in this Assembly over and over again, as one of the reasons for demanding representation by population, that our money was given away to sections which contributed little or nothing to the general revenue; that while we paid seventy per cent. of the revenue and Lower Canada only thirty per cent., an equal proportion of the expenditure was enjoyed by Lower Canada; and that under this system Upper Canada was paying not only for its own local improvements