

counties are the seven named above, and Vaudreuil, L'Islet, Brome, Argenteuil, Bonaventure and Chambly. There are sixteen Upper Canada constituencies, with an aggregate population of 505,359 souls, that send only sixteen members to represent them; while there are twenty-eight Lower Canada constituencies, and fourteen Upper Canada constituencies, with an aggregate population of 501,287, that send no fewer than forty-two members to represent them! Thirty-nine members of Parliament represent constituencies having in the aggregate 1,248,579 souls; while all the other ninety-one members represent only 1,256,783! There are twenty members of the House who represent an aggregate constituency of 198,084, while there are other twenty members who represent 642,503! One half the House (sixty-five members) sit for 909,503 souls, while the other half sit for 1,585,448. Nothing could be more unjust, more utterly absurd, in a country almost entirely agricultural and having no class interests to be protected. I can well understand an objection being raised to population as the sole basis of representation. I can understand how territory may be contended for as an additional basis. I can understand how education may be contended for as a basis of representation—or wealth, or taxation, or even hereditary succession. However much I may dissent from such propositions, I can well understand how an argument upon them may be sustained; but I confess I never could comprehend with what sense or justice a united people, under one Legislature and Government, could in 1864 be divided for representative purposes by an imaginary division line drawn in 1792, without regard to population, wealth, taxation, or any other consideration than the existence of that magic line. But, gentlemen, unjust as this is—humiliating as it is for the people of Upper Canada to occupy so inferior a position in the body politic—the practical injury and injustice become intolerable when we look at the enormous proportion of the general taxation contributed by the people of Upper Canada. Many years ago it was admitted by the Lower Canadians themselves that Upper Canada contributed 67 per cent. to the general revenue, and Lower Canada only 33 per cent.; but this was under the fact, and no one conversant with our commercial statistics now ventures to deny that Upper Canada pays three-fourths of the whole Provincial taxation—if, indeed, she does not pay four-fifths. A better illustration cannot be given than that of the excise duties. These duties have been recently very largely increased. Last year they yielded \$771,164. Now, of this sum Lower Canada paid \$192,932, and Upper Canada not less than \$578,232—and no doubt a large portion of the articles on which these excise duties were paid in Lower Canada found their way into Upper Canada for consumption. Now, is it to be borne that a section of the people of Canada, less by four hundred thousand than the other section, and paying but one pound of taxation out of every four or five pounds going into the public chest, should send to Parliament one half of the whole number of representatives? And the curious part of the matter is, that while Upper Canada is made to contribute this disproportionate share of the revenue, the division of the expenditure is very far from being regulated on the same system. The lion's share of the expenditure invariably goes to Lower Canada; and if an extra sum at any time has to be voted to Upper Canada for any special purpose, a corresponding sum must be invariably appropriated to Lower Canada, to maintain the equilibrium! Three or four to one is the principle of taxation—equality is the principle of expenditure! And the industrial projects of the two sections are equally disproportionate. In the year 1859—the last of which we have official returns—the wheat raised in Upper Canada was 24,620,425 bushels, and in Lower Canada only