

representation. The next question is whether there has not been a vast decrease in the population in some sections of the country. When you speak of representation by population, taking it as it exists, when you have to take the smaller constituencies and add them to others, I think it does not require much thought to form an opinion of the difficulty that surrounds any government in dealing with a matter of that kind. I do not require to go beyond my own county, where I have been living since 1833, for an illustration of this. I think my hon. friend, when he was Premier in the local House, had something to do with this matter. If you can imagine a more outrageous division you would require a more vivid imagination than I possess. Hastings is divided into three ridings for the local House. The north riding was properly divided. What do you suppose the hon. gentleman's Government did? They set to work and tacked on a large portion of the county of Renfrew—a district miles and miles away from the north riding of Hastings. And why? Because they thought under the circumstances it would secure the election of a Liberal, and the suggestion came from that very good Liberal, the gentleman who introduced into the constituency a bogus ballot box, by which the ballots of the Conservative voters could be shunted out, and the Liberal ballots put in. How do hon. gentlemen suppose a canvasser would get to a portion of that constituency in the north? He had to travel from Belleville to Ottawa, and up the Ottawa river some hundred miles, in order to reach that portion of the north riding of Hastings as amended.

That is one of the cases to which my hon. friend refers. If he wishes to come to a later case, the last redistribution of the county of Hastings is an example. That county runs from the Bay of Quinte back about one hundred miles north. It is three township wide. They took the city of Belleville and the townships running north of it for one hundred miles, and they took two townships on the east side of it, which gave it the appearance of two bay windows. Why did they take in those two townships? The reason was that in one there was a Conservative majority of one hundred and fifty and in the other a Conservative majority of two hundred and fifty, and that would give any Conservatives who got the nomination two or three thousand of a majority, and by taking those two townships out of the riding to which they properly belonged, it would give the Liberals in

that riding a fighting chance. I do not say that they would have carried it. I think we could have beaten them even with the division which they made. So flagrant was the work, in this division, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself, when it was pointed out to him how the ridings were cut up, consented to have the two townships placed in the ridings where they belonged. So disgusted were the voters in both ridings that Mr. Northrup carried the east riding by thirteen or fourteen hundred majority. Honest Liberals—and there are some of them: they are not all of the same grade—did not approve of that redistribution. I could show the House a number of other cases of similar character. I deem it my duty, in the instances which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, in reference to redistribution Bills and the action of the Senate, to show that these Bills were not of the character he would lead us to believe. Whether intentionally or not, he left the impression on the minds of those who heard him that the Senate, in these cases, was dealing with the Redistribution Bill introduced into the House of Commons under the constitution by which we are governed. I knew, at the time, it was not correct, but I did not wish to interrupt him, because an opportunity would present itself to set the House right on this question.

In reference to the Naval Bill, the hon. gentleman from Halifax said he was opposed to such a large expenditure. I may say that I am not. I would spend every dollar the country can afford to strengthen the navy of the empire. I do not propose to waste time in discussing the Laurier or the Borden scheme at the present moment. But I do say that to adopt a system by which there would be two units, one on the Pacific coast and one on the Atlantic, totally independent of the navy of the empire, would be throwing the money into the sea. The expenditure would be utterly useless. I appreciate the reasons given by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Loughheed) for not introducing the Naval Bill this year, but I do not agree with him. If I had any influence, or could induce the Government to act, I would introduce that Bill every session that I was in power, and compel the Liberal Senators to record their votes. And I know from my own experience, in the section of the country in which I live what the effect would be. I have heard one or two members make the statement