

constituency, may be to give the minority, as they call it, a majority of the representatives. Then, as I understand it, they also object to this measure because some constituencies have been left as they were instead of being changed. They refer to the constituency of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and they say it was not touched, because if it had been touched it would probably either injure him or some surrounding constituency politically, and therefore nothing was done. If that were true—I do not say it is true—we have again a precedent for that to be drawn from the legislation of that body where, as I have said, Reform principles find their most perfect illustration. What do we find? We find that Brockville, in the preceding Legislature, was represented by a Conservative, the hon. member who now represents it in this House. It had a population, at that time, of 10,475. It was necessary to readjust the representation there, and therefore they added some of the surrounding municipalities so as to give it a population of 13,937—of course, entirely with a view of equalizing the representation as compared with the population. But, when we come to Cornwall, what do we find? We find a smaller population, only 7,114. Yet, what was the fact? They left that as it was, and for the reason given in the comments of the press at the time. And in regard to Cornwall, we can find no better justification than that given in the columns of the *Globe*. On the 15th of September, 1874, that journal stated:

“Cornwall alone is left untouched, in obedience certainly not to any political exigencies, but to the very strongly expressed desire of the surrounding constituencies to remain for the present without alteration. A desire it was the more easy to gratify because there was no reason to suppose a change would be made in the political character of the representation of the district by any reasonable scheme of readjustment that could be devised.”

So that in the case of Cornwall, where nothing could be done to improve things, because nothing could be done to improve things this small borough was left untouched; but in the case of Brockville, where something could be done to improve things, according to the view of hon. gentlemen opposite, a large addition was made from the surrounding district to that constituency.

Mr. BOWELL. What was the result?

Mr. WHITE. A gentleman who is not likely to get a seat in South Grenville, who had worn his welcome out, found a very comfortable seat at Brockville. I do not say this object was to give him a seat, but the object was to give some one who is favorable to the Government a seat. So we have this fact, that in the legislation of the Reform party, when they had absolute control of it, they gave to a minority of votes, nine out of thirteen seats; and in those two boroughs to which I have referred, in one case they readjusted it in order to secure a change, and, in the other case, according to their own statements, they left it as it was, because they could not improve its political complexion. If ever there was hypocrisy exemplified it was in the attempt of hon. gentlemen opposite to raise the cry that political exigencies alone dictated the changes made in this particular Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The last speaker has attempted to prove that political exigencies demanded the measure now before this House for the hon. gentleman quoted as a precedent, and as the authority and warrant for its submission, that the Mowat Government had enacted a measure something of the same kind and for the purpose of securing seats for the supporters of his Government. The hon. gentleman appears to have been cognizant of the fact that this measure had been proposed for political effect, and the defence is that the leader of a Government in another House had committed a similar act. I deem that it is not true, for the leader of the Ontario Government endeavored to preserve county boundaries, a principle which is violated under the present measure. In regard to the equalization

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

of population, it will be remembered there was very little excitement and expression in regard to the Ontario Government. As far as I am aware, little exception was taken to the affair, but the hon. gentleman is aware that there is indignation deep, loud and widespread over this measure, and that it is not confined to the Reform party. Why, to-day, the hon. gentleman has restored South Wellington and North Wentworth, and hon. members on this side of the House think it is in obedience to the demand from political supporters in Halton. The hon. gentleman, exercising a spirit of fairness, should meet the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Gillies) half way. If the hon. the leader of the Government has any sense of fair play left he will accept the proposition of that hon. member. Granting there may be greater increase of population, and, compared with the other riding, the change proposed by that hon. member would still leave his riding with 2,000 more than the other riding. The hon. the leader of the Government having shown his willingness to go so far in amending the Bill, will be guilty of showing the white feather if he does not entertain the proposition. If Saugeen and Port Elgin are added to North Bruce—and it is known that the present member has been already nominated as the candidate for the riding—the change would only give him about one hundred and seventy votes more towards a chance of political existence in the next contest. Let there be some sense of manliness, some sense of fair play. Let hon. gentlemen go into the contest prepared to vindicate their principles of equalization of population as near as possible; accept the hon. gentleman's amendment, for in doing so you will still leave his riding 2,000 less than the other ridings of Bruce.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I make the numbers 20,735 as against West Bruce, 22,355, but an hon. member informs me I am out 1,000.

Mr. SHAW. Nearer 2,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that that would equalize the population? Would North Bruce be still less?

Mr. SHAW. A little, I think.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman makes the admission and the point is gained. If they yield to the proposition of my hon. friend, North Bruce will still be in a minority, but hon. gentlemen cannot go on to lay down their high and holy principle of equalizing the population while they perpetrate this inequality. I am glad to notice that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) displays at last a little sense of shame—or shall I call it, a spirit of manliness. We heard him rise and defend the Bill as it stood, he defended the monstrous iniquity of allowing a population of 17,000 in North Bruce and 25,000 in West Bruce. But when the hon. Premier was prepared to give a little in a direction which would not hurt him, the hon. gentleman, for the purpose of having his character stand a little better in the minds of the honorable men of Bruce, before whom he is shortly to go, remarked that he was willing to give up half of Saugeen. The hon. gentleman, for the purpose of strengthening himself, though he had a majority of seventy-five, took steps—for he was a party to it—did not we hear him say, “we,” as he spoke of this arrangement? What did this hon. gentleman of the “we” party arrange to do with reference to himself? He was afraid to meet the electors without having 461 votes added to the seventy-five which he had before, and yet he thinks it consistent with the position of an honorable, a fair-minded and a manly man to refuse to give up the township of Saugeen. I say it is lowering the dignity of the House, and one of the worst features of the Bill is that hon. gentlemen, who should regard one another with fair-play and decency, lead themselves to tactics so unfair