

a thing of that sort. I think that it is the duty of members to go back to the constituencies that sent them here and render an account of their stewardship to them and not to totally different constituencies as they now propose to do. In addition to all this, which is limited to Ontario, they propose to take into their hands the power of appointing returning officers, a most objectionable feature, and one which indicates a decided retrograde step—a step twenty years back, not in time, but in political civilization. But if the principle of representation by population is a good thing why is Ontario to have a monopoly of it? Why should the other provinces not have the same advantage?

HON. MR. FLINT—Let them pass a representation by population bill and they will get it then.

HON. MR. POWER—Take the Province of Prince Edward Island. There are three counties in that Province returning two members each. Queens has a population of 48,000 while the adjoining county has only 26,000. So that one man in Kings County is as good as two in Queens. The City and County of Halifax return together two representatives for a population of 67,917. The County of Cape Breton has a population of only 31,258 and it returns two members, so that one man in Cape Breton is rather better than two men in Halifax. The County of Queens has a population of 10,577, returning one member, so that in that county one man is rather better than three men in Halifax. The same disproportion exists in Inverness and other constituencies. Then take New Brunswick: the County of Sunbury has a population of 7,651; Restigouche has 7,038, and each of these counties returns one member, while Westmoreland with a population of 37,719 has only one representative. York has a population of over 30,000, and returns only one member. Now, if representation by population is so good a thing we, who adopted it so many years ago in the lower provinces, are entitled to it as well as the people in Ontario are. An examination of the Census will show this fact about Quebec: there are thirteen members from that province who average 31,422 constituents each, and twenty-five members representing an

average of only 13,048 each, and there are six members from Quebec who represent on the average only 10,297, so that hon. gentlemen will see that the pretext (perhaps it is not a parliamentary word) advanced by the Government that this Bill is intended to honestly carry out the principle of representation by population has no foundation in fact. This is the first time, as far as I know, in the history of any British province or colony in which the party in power have undertaken by an unfair manipulation of the constituencies to keep themselves in office; and if the Conservatives regain power by this measure they can continue to repeat the process indefinitely. One of the practical results of this measure will be either such an outburst of popular indignation as will put an end to attempts of this kind in the future, or we shall before long have a dissolution of the Confederation. I think it is well that the Government have selected Ontario for the first attack; because it is a powerful province, one that has the will as well as the power to resent the unfair way in which she has been treated. This Bill coming after the disallowance of provincial acts and after the refusal to carry out the boundary award, is very likely to create a spirit of hostility against the Government in Ontario which will lead to a complete failure of this measure and probably to the defeat of the Government. If it does not we shall probably before very long find this country reduced to the level of Mexico or some of the South American republics where they have the form of responsible government but not the substance, and where the party in power violates the constitution to retain office until a rebellion of the people puts them out.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—As I will not have an opportunity to vote on this measure, having paired, I wish to say that what I have heard from the hon. gentlemen who oppose this Bill has not been sufficient to induce me to vote against it. In the House of Commons the leaders of the Opposition did not disapprove of the principle of the Bill, if I understand their motions correctly. It is easy to see from the record that while Mr. Blake moved an amendment to the motion of Sir John A. Macdonald, disapproving of some of its details he did not negative the principle