

and fair and proper. They know that all their declarations, all their oppositions, will be regarded by the people as *vox et præterea nihil*.

Mr. RYMAL. Say it over again.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, I shall say it over again that the people will tell them it is all wind, all gas, all nonsense, what they have been uttering. I do not know whether it would be parliamentary for me to use an expression with reference to the minority here which has been used with reference to a minority elsewhere. We know that lately an Irish member of Parliament was called to account by his constituents for having voted in favor of the cloture resolutions in the Imperial House of Commons, and he wrote to tell his constituents that they did not understand the subject, and that the cloture was necessary as a guardian of free debate, and as a protection of the majority against a "blatherskite" minority. Now, I hope it will not be found that all the opposition to the Government for the last four years has been "blatherskite," and that all the dissatisfied people can be hived together in a few townships, so that their influence will not be felt. I say, again, that it is impossible for the minority to hive the majority, and if the supporters of the present Government are, as hon. gentlemen say, in a minority in the Province of Ontario, then I say it is impossible to so group the constituencies that hon. gentlemen opposite will not have a majority from that Province. But by their language in this House, by the terror they have shown, by the agonizing shrieks they have given, we see that they believe they are lost as a political party. I accept this Bill as the best one which I believe could be produced under the present state of things, although, for my own part, I believe another principle might have been very properly introduced, and that is the principle of grouping together some of the constituencies into districts, so as to give representation to the minority in those districts. I believe that the Parliament of this country should be the mirror of the nation, that it should represent faithfully, all shades of thought in the country, and that the minority in every district should be represented here. I would like to see the city of Toronto, for instance, with its three representatives, made a district in which every man would have two votes, so that the minority would have one representative from that city; and I would like to see the same principle applied to some of the other large districts. That is my view, but it does not receive the weight which I think it is entitled to, and it is useless for me to press it. But under the present system, when we come to divide up the country so that each constituency will have one member, then I say the right hon. gentleman has striven to his utmost in this Bill, to give a fair representation according to population. For the last quarter of a century, hon. gentlemen opposite have been dinging into his ears, and badgering him with resolution after resolution, to adopt the principle of representation by population; and he has striven in this Bill to do so as far as possible. But whatever he does meets with the same opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite. They never admit that anything he introduces can have a principle of right about it at all. When we consider that the Province of Ontario has a right to have four additional members, and consider that the representation of Cornwall and Niagara have been taken away, we must see that the Government has made as few changes in the representation as possible by this Bill, and that they have been guided solely, apparently by a desire to equalize the population. When hon. gentlemen opposite declare that the Bill has done them an injury, they do not think what it has done to hon. gentlemen on our side of the House. There are two hon. gentlemen on this side legislated out of their seats altogether, but we do not hear a word of condolence for them. Because the Bill has not been framed to meet their views, they declare that it is

wrong. I do not think the House or the country will regard it in the same light, but every fair-minded man who looks at it dispassionately will say that it is designed to give Ontario a far representation according to population.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think it is very fit that the hon. member for Frontenac should appear as the champion of this Bill. There were three principles laid down by the hon. First Minister and the hon. Minister of Customs, which they said had regulated their ideas in framing it: one was the principle of equalizing the population, another the principle of having regard to territory, and the third the principle of having regard to growth. Each one of these three principles, in the case of the hon. member for Frontenac, has been grossly violated. His constituency contains 300 square miles as against 120 square miles in the neighboring constituency; it has a population of 14,900, while the constituency alongside has 23,870; his county during the last ten years has lost nearly 10 per cent. of its population, while the county alongside grew nearly 10 per cent. The hon. gentleman is, therefore, the right man in the right place in upholding as gross a piece of trickery as ever was inflicted on any people. There is not one single solitary principle that those hon. gentlemen ever professed, including the principles professed by the hon. First Minister in 1872, which this Bill does not grossly and daringly violate. And naturally the hon. gentleman whose constituency is an example of distinct violation of the three rules which this hon. gentleman laid down, is the first to applaud it. The hon. gentleman spoke of some remarks made on this side of the House, as being *vox et præterea nihil*. He could not have hit on a better description, not only in his own speech on this occasion, but of his usual speeches in this House. In the present speech there was not one original idea; the only idea uttered was one stolen from the Aurora speech of the hon. member for West Durham—that Parliament should be a mirror of the feelings of the people.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That idea was expressed long before.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. As regards Lennox, I had something to do with arranging that county in 1867; as regards Frontenac and Addington, I do not remember having taken any particular action. But, in 1876, Lennox, which then contained a population of 16,500, was within the nearest fraction of the fair quotient which the several constituencies ought to have contained. But I merely rose to call attention to the extreme propriety and fitness of the hon. member for Frontenac, who in his own person unites all the objections that can well be taken to the measure, being its advocate.

Mr. GILLIES. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for South Bruce bring forward the point he has urged. As to the facts of the case, they are so plain as to require little argument. This county has got 64,000 population, giving 21,000 for each riding. The only point he endeavored to make was that the territory to the north was larger than the territory to the west and south. Now, the Indian Peninsula was offered for sale in the fall of 1855 at Owen Sound, and a very large portion sold. At the same time other portions of Bruce were also offered for sale, and were sold and settled. How was it that the Indian Peninsula in that section, if it was a country capable of settlement, was not settled? The simple reason is that the country is so rocky and difficult of settlement that no people would settle in it. In the days when it was offered for sale, shortly after the Russian war, there was a land fever, and any actual purchasers did not know the quality of the land. Finding it was so inferior in quality people would not settle on it. Of late years some settlers have gone in to take off the timber. The more people know of this region, the more they are inclined to view it as inferior