

dissent, was rejected in the House of Lords, although it was well known that the country was decidedly in its favor, although this was so much felt to be the case, that no one ventured to oppose it. Even men like Lord Randolph Churchill and Sir Stafford Northcote, who, months before, had expressed themselves in opposition to the extension of the franchise in counties, after the second reading had been defeated in the House of Lords, declared that they were in favor of the extension of the franchise, but said the Bill was not only to be used for the extension of the franchise but for the purpose of altering the constituencies and unduly increasing the strength of the Liberal party, and as a matter of protection and in order to protect the rights of their party, and for no other purpose, the House of Lords exercised its power and defeated the second reading of the Bill. What was done by the Government? The Government had an overwhelming majority in the House and in the country in their favor. Public indignation was excited to such an extent, that it was only necessary for Mr. Gladstone to have said that he would insist upon an alteration of the constitution of the House of Lords, and the whole country would have followed him.

Mr. McNEILL. No.

Mr. MILLS. One hon. gentleman says no. I think he is the only one in this country who would say no. Anyone who knows the course of English public affairs knows that that is true.

Mr. McNEILL. No, certainly not.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I differ with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McNEILL. I differ with you.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman can express his opinion when he comes to make his speech; he will allow me now to state my view. I say that public opinion in England would have sustained Mr. Gladstone if he had taken a position antagonistic to the House of Lords.

Mr. BOWELL. It would have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. MILLS. Did he do so. No, he agreed to a conference with Lord Salisbury, and they agreed; so that the plan of redistribution became a matter of treaty or compact between the leaders of the two parties, the one having an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons so great that there was no division when that Bill was read the third time, and yet Mr. Gladstone agreed with Lord Salisbury as to the plan upon which the seats in Parliament should be distributed. That was a matter of compact or arrangement. Why? Because it was felt that it would not be proper for the Government to use to the utmost the power they possessed in order, as Lord Salisbury expressed the opinion, to increase the strength of the Liberal party in the House to an extent beyond that to which it would be properly entitled in proportion to its strength in the country. An agreement was come to between the leaders of the two parties, and an assurance was given that the power of the majority would not be abused for the purpose of promoting the interest of that party against the minority. Has the hon. gentleman given any such assurance here? We say that the object of this measure is to unduly increase the strength of the Tory party in Parliament, and to take out of the hands of the people that control which they have over the voters' lists and put it into the hands of the majority. It is not representation in regard to the strength of parties, but a representation by which the Tory party is to have a majority in this House, whether it is supported by a majority of the voters in the country or not. There is a violation of every principle of Parliamentary Government in the measure now before us, and what assurance have we that this will not be abused most seriously, not only by carrying the Indian

Mr. MILLS.

clause but by the character of the men who are to be appointed revising barristers? Has the leader of the Government approached the leader of the Opposition as Mr. Gladstone approached Lord Salisbury? It is true, the measure has not been defeated in the Senate, because the Government has a majority in both Houses, but Mr. Gladstone was supported by the nation.

Mr. McNEILL. No.

Mr. MILLS. The nation was overwhelmingly in favor of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, so much so that Lord Salisbury declared himself in favor of the extension of the franchise which twelve months before he was opposed to. We are exercising our rights here as the House of Lords did in England. Our rights are as much secured to us as the rights of a second chamber under the constitution itself, and the hon. gentleman knows that we have not abused the power which we possessed and which is our constitutional right. We have confined ourselves to a strict discussion of this question. We have pointed out its objectionable features and have sought to point them out to the country, and how are we met by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite? The organ of the Minister of Customs himself has not ventured to state the facts in regard to this measure.

Mr. BOWELL. What paper? I did not know that I had an organ.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is reputed to have one.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not occupy the position towards any journal that you do towards the *London Advertiser*.

Mr. MILLS. It is well known that the hon. gentleman, for many years while a member of this House, was connected with the *Belleville Intelligencer*.

Mr. BOWELL. No, Sir, I was not.

Mr. MILLS. Was either the editor or controlled the paper.

Mr. BOWELL. Neither the one nor the other. There is just as much truth in the assertion you have made now with reference to my connection with the *Belleville Intelligencer*, as there is in nineteen-twentieths of what you have said in the three hours' speech you have been making.

Mr. MILLS. Well, then, even if that be so, there is no doubt whatever with regard to the hon. gentleman's position on that paper.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, if you are to be judge of what constitutes the truth.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had a present connection with the paper, that he was now controlling it; I said that the hon. gentleman, when he came into this House, and for a long time afterwards, was the editor of that paper—at all events, he was reputed to be so; and when that paper was receiving advertisements from the Government, we know the hon. gentleman's seat was vacated, and we know his leader stated that he had vacated his seat under the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. BOWELL. I challenged you and your party to contest it, and you did not dare do it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, then, challenged his leader.

Mr. BOWELL. I had nothing to do with the leader.

Mr. MILLS. No, he had not; but the leader did have something to say with regard to the report.

Mr. BOWELL. No; these 62½ cents I received was while you were in power. You know it very well, and what is the use standing there and talking in that manner?