

tion, which will render interested combinations between the representatives of particular local interests far more difficult, and therefore less likely to take place; as the responsibility of undertaking each work will be made to rest distinctly on the Government, and the Government will naturally decide for or against each claim, on much more general views than those on which individual interested members, acting to a great degree without responsibility, can be expected to decide. How then can either Province be sacrificed, or its interests be postponed to the other?

It is asserted, we are well aware, by the party whose views we are now examining, that two instances of this postponement have taken place already—in the assumption, by the United Province, of certain debts incurred by Upper Canada, and in the apportionment of an equal number of members to Upper and Lower Canada respectively, the population of the one being so much less numerous than that of the other. The inference sought to be established from these facts, we deny altogether. The debts of the Upper Province are debts incurred for objects of common advantage. It is possible enough that some of those objects may not have been selected in the very best manner for the interests of either, and that some of the money spent upon them might have been saved by better management. But this is nothing to the point. The question is, whether Lower Canada is really made to pay too dearly for the vast advantages she is to derive from the Union, (among which advantages is to be ranked her future use of these very works, completed as the Union soon will complete them) by the share of responsibility which is now to fall on her for the debts incurred in their construction. And to this question we can imagine but one answer. As to the second point, the equality of the representation of the provinces, the answer is no less obvious. It is an arrangement certainly not to the disadvantage of Lower Canada. Just at present it may seem hard to give two populations the same voice, when one is almost half as numerous again as the other; but then, within a short term of years, beyond the possibility of doubt, the proportions will be reversed, and the population of the western country become much the larger of the two. In framing a law of this kind, it is necessary to look to the future as well as to the present. The new country, which is fast increasing, has

a right to a heavier vote in the public councils than the old one, which can increase but slowly. Besides, looking even only to the present, who does not see in the greater general enterprise and intelligence of the people of Upper Canada, the strongest of all claims to political consideration? Extent of country and number of population are not the only points to be kept in view, nor even the most material. An objector may argue that the abstract principle of a representation periodically varying, according to some ascertained rule of territory and population, ought to have been adopted; and in his zeal for this theory may wholly overlook the fact, that no approach to a fair rule of this kind has ever been made in either province, and that it is therefore a little too much to insist upon it, that the Union Act must, at all events, for the first time introduce the principle. It is not our intention, however, here to discuss any such point as this. The question is not, by what abstract rule the representation of a country may be best adjusted; but, whether or not the scale actually adopted in the present instance is substantially a fair one; and no further argument can be required to establish our proposition, that it is so.

The considerations we have been urging more than suffice, if we are not much mistaken, to prove the assertion with which we set out, that the current objections to the Union Act, drawn from the aspect of affairs in Lower Canada, are utterly without foundation. Neither class of objectors within the province, French or English, has taken any thing like a right view of the case; and those, therefore, who in Upper Canada or elsewhere repeat the statements and show the fears of either, are merely partners with them in error. The extent of this error has been fully shown, only by contrasting the imaginary mischiefs they predict from the Union, with the great and lasting good it must in reality bring to pass. In some degree we have already done this in the course of the remarks we have made. Our limits allow us here to add only a few words more as to the positive advantages Lower Canada is to derive from the Union.

The Union, be it remembered, is the one and only means that offers of giving Lower Canada the enjoyment of Representative Institutions, and a Local Government popularly administered. After the experience of the past, who but a madman could wish to risk a second con-