

Mr. CASEY. I have to make, with regard to my county, objections of a similar character to those made by many other hon. members in regard to their counties. The general objections made to the scope of the Bill itself have been justified and strengthened in the course of this debate. As one change has followed another in this Bill, it has become more and more apparent that the Bill is the production of continued caucusing, and that the caucusing has not stopped yet. Local districts have sent down their representatives and those representatives have been heard, and while the country at large is refused an opportunity of properly understanding this Bill and of expressing their opinions upon it, the supporters of the Government have been heard on every point, and at their dictation and representation alterations have been made to meet exigencies not at first provided for. A still further proof that the Bill is indefensible is the fact that hon. members opposite do not, as a rule, attempt to defend it. The occasional speeches that have been made in favor of the Bill have not been made by the members of the Government or their leading supporters, but by junior members of the party, who have perhaps escaped the party reins and talked when they were not wanted to talk. The rule seems to have been promulgated by the leaders of the opposite side that the Bill shall not be discussed on that side, because the more it is discussed the more indefensible it must appear. This very afternoon one portion at least was made to appear so indefensible that the Government had to give their influence and votes to the removal of that provision. With regard to Elgin, the population of that municipal county is almost the exact quota for two members, viz., a little over 21,000 each. The difference between the two ridings is very considerable as they are now arranged. That difference, of course, it was part of the declared policy of the Government to remove as far as possible; but it was also part of their declared policy not only to remove the difference, but to reduce the average of these ridings to as nearly the quota as possible. I have pointed out that in the case of the two Elgins they could not reduce the average to a point nearer the average quota of the Dominion than as it stands, but they could have removed the inequality of the two ridings by making the changes within the boundaries of the county itself. But instead of doing so they have seen fit to begin a series of changes affecting several of the neighboring counties, by adding to the county of Elgin at one end and cutting it off on the other, something on the principle of the Irishman who found his blanket was too short, and he cut off a piece at one end and added it to the other end in order to make it longer. The Government have done so with the county of Elgin; they have cut off one township at one end and put two new townships on to the other end, and they have succeeded in making it a little longer than it was before. They have given the county a total population of 49,000, which is considerably more than the required quota for two members. They have disarranged the representation of those two ridings in such a way as to give the individual electors of Elgin a much smaller share of representation than they had before. They had already, on the average, just the share they should have had, compared with the rest of the Dominion—one member for every 24,000; they have now only one for every 24,500. The hon. Minister has disfranchised the two townships added by putting them in a riding where their vote will have no effect on the result. They have not succeeded yet in reducing the population of East Elgin to nearly the point of the required quota. When East Elgin is reduced it contains nearly 26,000 people, and is larger than Carleton, East Peterborough, Muskoka, South Simcoe, South Huron, South Wellington, or North Bruce, all of which were found to be so large that the Government declared it necessary in the interest of fair representation to reduce these ridings; and yet by the changes they have made, they have left East Elgin much

Mr. MILLS.

larger than any of those constituencies. It is therefore quite clear that equalization was not the object in the arrangement of that riding, at all events. I might further point out that the two ridings of Elgin as now arranged contain a somewhat larger population than the two ridings of Ontario before they were re-arranged, and yet the Government declared that, in the interest of fair representation, they were compelled to reduce the representation of the Ontarios, notwithstanding which they have increased the two Elgins from having exactly the proper quota up to a point above that at which the Ontarios stood before they reduced them. I therefore move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Elgin contains a population of 42,361 souls, and is divided into two ridings, each returning one member to the House of Commons, with an average population of 21,180 per member, which is very near the average quota for the Dominion.

That by the proposed Bill the township of South Dorchester and the village of Springfield are transferred from East Elgin to East Middlesex, and the town of Ridgetown and the townships of Oxford and Howard are transferred from Bothwell to West Elgin for electoral purposes.

That by these changes the population of East Elgin becomes 25,806 and that of West Elgin 23,477, being a total of 49,277 for the two ridings, or an average of 24,638 per member, which is much further from the quota for the Dominion than the present average.

That by the transfer of the city of St. Thomas from the east riding to the west riding, the population of each riding would be as follows: East Elgin, 19,780; West Elgin, 22,581.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the municipal county of Elgin be divided into two ridings, each returning one member.

Amendment (Mr. Casey) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Baunerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Lowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Snaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McCaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLellan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—22.