reat seal of other man pointed in action for vernment ending the gment was l a Statute ffice from he will of rio. Now, interfered nd affecthat it was then the cisely the Canadian gislature Legisla-

DED.

isallowusually laldwell inces to

within Legisoperty

ecause n the le cost iterest

of prir the on the bimnts of st fif-

sdicig it
ohn
d to
ance
the

ght as The ins

all sed ial sly on of lumber down a stream, finds the highway unobstructed, he is at liberty, in my judgment, to make use of it without inquiring by whom, or with what motive, the way has been made practicable. He find the rock on the road allowance blasted, or the chasm that crossed it bridged, and he pursues his journey along the highway thus improved; or he finds that the freshet covers all obstacles with a sufficient depth of water, and he floats his logs down the highway thus made useful. It may be in appearance and perhaps in reality rather hard on the man at whose expense what was a highway only in legal conterplation becomes one fit for profitable use, has to allow others to shave in the advantage without contributing to the cost. That is, however, a matter for his own consideration when he makes the improvement.

#### PRECEDENT.

But it is said that during the Liberal Administration a bill passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, involving the same principle as the Streams Bill, was disallowed, and of course the Liberal party have no right to complain if their own precedent is followed. The Bill referred to is known as "An Act to amend "the Land Purchase Act of 1875." It was passed by the Legislature and reserved by the Lieutenant Governor for the assent of the Governor General, and had no resemblance whatever to the Streams Bill. To prove that there is nothing in common between the two Bills, attention is invited to the following particulars:

following particulars:
1. The Prince Edward Island Act affected several of Her Majesty's subjects who were not residents of the Dominion, and in that respect came within clause 7 of the Governor General's instructions from the Imperial Government, which required him to refuse his assent to such a Bill.

2. The rights of the Crown were clearly affected by it. Under 14 Vic., chap. 3 of the Island, the quit rents reserved to the Crown by the original grant were assigned to the Government of the Province. The "Land Purchase Act" directed the Commissioners, authorized by that Act, to consider "the rents reserved in the original grant, and how far payment of the same has been remitted by the Crown."

3. The rights of the parties in Prince Edward Island to certain interests in the lands affected were never questioned. Mr. McLaren never had any rights to the exclusive use of the stream in dispute. He was a thespasser on public property.

4. The rights of the Crown were affected by the Prince Edward Island legislation perhaps injuriously. In the case of the Streams Bill, the rights of the Ontario Government and the public generally were

protected from the usurpation of a private citizen.

5. The rights of the parties affected by the Prince Edward Island Bill were not preserved. In the case of the Streams Bill McLaren's rights were carefully guarded, and privileges accorded to him which the courts afterwards decided he had no right to claim, so it is clear that neither by precedent nor by constitutional rule was the Minister of Justice justified in disallowing the Streams Bill.

## GERRYMANDERING.

### HIVING THE CRITS.

POLITICAL TYRANNY REDUCED TO A SCIENCE—INFAMOUS USE OF POWER.

By the Confederation Act of 1867 the Province of Quebec was allotted 65 members and the Province of Ontario 82. It was provided, however, that Ontario and the Maritime Provinces should receive such additional members as they might be entitled to taking Quebec as the unit of measure. In 1872 Ontario on this principle received six additional members. In bringing down the Bill providing for the increased representation, Sir John Macdonald distinctly laid down the principle that the redistribution of the six seats then at his disposal should be made without interfering with the municipal county lines.

#### MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES

This principle, so strongly contended for by Sir John Macdonald in 1872, is utterly ignored in the Redistribution Bill of 1882.

# THE BOUNDARIES OF NO LESS THAN TWENTY-FOUR

Municipal Counties are sacrificed in order that safe seats might be provided for his disorganized and cowardly supporters—the principles of 1872 are sacrificed to prop up the declining popularity of his corrupt Government, and by the most flagrant violation of the well accredited policy of his own party, it is sought to snatch a verdict from a people anxious to shake off the bonds in which they are so reluctantly held. The following are the counties whose municipal boundaries are affected:—Carleton, Lanark, Leeds, Peterboro', Victoria, Ontario, York, Lincoln, Simcoe, Haldimand, Wentworth, Halton, Welllngton, Gray, Brant, Oxford, Norfolk, Perth, Elgin, Kent, Essex, Lambton, Middlesex and Huron. Shall these counties forget this wrong when the elections take place, or shall they tell Sir