

well is not a municipality, that it is part of Kent and a part of Lambton. Kent has upwards of 54,000 population. Now, if the hon. gentleman wished to deal fairly, why did he not give two members to Kent and two to Lambton? Why not do away with the county of Bothwell altogether. The east riding of Kent would not have been more populous than the west riding is at this moment, and if he wishes to adopt the principle of representation by population, why not give to the two counties of Kent and Lambton five members in this House? They would have 21,000 of a population for each representative. If he had wished to adopt that principle, he could have formed a new county out of these two counties, which would have had upwards of 21,000 of a population. Then the hon. gentleman has taken off two townships and a town in which there is a large Reform vote, as I shall show when the Bill comes up for the second reading, and tacks them to the west riding of Elgin; but when we look at the county of Elgin we find it has a population of 42,161, and if the hon. gentleman wished to equalize the population, all that was necessary was to detach the city of St. Thomas from the east riding and add it to the west riding; then we should have had about the same population in the two ridings. But it is perfectly obvious that that would not have served the purpose of the right hon. gentleman; it would not have served the interests and objects of his friends; for it is obvious that the intention of the right hon. gentleman is to legislate himself and his party into Parliament, no matter what may be the views of the majority of the electors of the Province of Ontario. The Bill is a disgraceful measure; it is a disgrace to the right hon. gentleman who submits it, and it is a disgrace to hon. members who support it. It is neither just nor magnanimous, and I say no person who has proper respect for the principles of constitutional government, and of giving to the political sentiment of the country a proper influence, will support the measure which the right hon. gentleman has submitted. It is a violation of the principles laid down by him in 1872, and it does not carry out the object which the right hon. gentleman stated was his object to-day, but which we know is not his object, because his object is to secure to himself and his friends that power which he believes the country, if fairly represented, would not give him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not at all surprised at the great warmth displayed by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell. They do not like the Bill, and why do they not like it? Because they think by a fair and equal adjustment of the population of Ontario they may lose some seats which they have to-day. When Mr. Fox made the great mistake of declaring that the Prince of Wales had a right to assume the Regina without a vote of Parliament, Mr. Pitt said triumphantly:

"I will unwhig that hon. gentleman if he ever goes back on whig principles."

The sole objection of hon. gentlemen opposite to the Bill is because we are equalizing the population.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Their sole objection, I say, is that we are equalizing the population, which was the great Reform principle of representation by population. In former times William Lyon Mackenzie raised the cry of representation by population, and made it ring through the Provinces of Upper Canada, and Upper Canada demanded that measure almost at the point of the bayonet. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite do not like representation by population. They do not like that the population should be arranged in constituencies nearly equal in numbers, and which would express, at all events much more equally, what the deliberate opinion of Ontario is than can be done now with constituencies varying from 30,000 to 34,000. This Bill secures in a great

Mr. BLAKE.

measure equality, and the different constituencies represented, if this Bill passes, will come here with equal force, authority and voice, and will represent more clearly and fully the views of all sections of the Province than is now done with the present inequalities. The hon. gentleman has quoted my speech in 1872. I do not go back on a single word of that speech. Although the hon. gentleman has said we received the support of the Opposition at that time, we received no such support; we were attacked as we have been now for gerrymandering, and making changes with political designs. I remember very well a distinguished and illustrious friend of my own, who sat on the other side of the House producing the picture of one of the ridings of Huron, and said they might worship that, because there was nothing like it in heaven above, on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth.

An hon. MEMBER. That was true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same objections were taken to the Bill of 1872, as are taken to the Bill of 1882, and with just as little reason. The same changes were brought ten years ago as now; but notwithstanding that fact hon. gentlemen opposite are so convinced we acted justly in that re-adjustment, that they are anxious to adhere to it; and, in 1892, if the hon. member for Bothwell and myself are sitting in the same relative positions as we are now, no doubt he will argue, and the leader of the Opposition will contend for the settlement of 1892, just as he is fighting now for the re-adjustment we made ten years ago. I do not go back on a single word of what I said then. I said then, and I say now, it is of great importance to keep the arrangement of the electoral and municipal divisions which were the same; but if the hon. gentlemen will take up the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario they will see what the Liberal party headed by Mr. Mowat did.

Mr. RYMAL. What has that got to do with the question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I contended then that it was of great importance that the municipal counties should be the electoral districts, and I gave my reasons: that young men would become first councillors, then reeves and then wardens, and there would be municipal as well as political uniformity. But we see that the Ontario Government have disregarded that—as is their business—and they have changed the municipal and judicial divisions.

Mr. BLAKE. How did they do it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will produce, in future discussions, a calculated statement, showing exactly what they have done. I say that Ontario has disregarded this principle, and has made the municipal districts different from the electoral districts. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said it is very wrong to take a township from one electoral district and add it to another. Mr. Mowat split townships and villages into two; and when I find that Ontario had, by a Liberal government, acting on Liberal principles, born, cradled and raised in accordance with the principles of responsible government, disregarded that principle, drawing a distinction between electoral and municipal representation, the whole object of my argument is gone and the impropriety of the change, if there be an impropriety, rests on the Liberal Government of Ontario, which is regulated by the power behind the Throne—the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition here. I did not hear what the hon. gentleman exclaimed against the redistribution of seats for the Province of Ontario. I did not hear his indignant tones ringing either on the stump, the platform, or elsewhere, against the legislation in that Province, and if the principle which I laid down in 1872 is to be destroyed, the blame rests there and not with us. Great was the sin, according to the hon. gentleman's language, and great will be the retribution of justice under this Bill. I remember something which happened in