

that does not prevent readjustment within the limits of each Province at any intervening Session. What we have to do now is to provide a fair representation for the population that now exists. If the population in one section of a county is largely increased because it is rapidly settled, there will be no difficulty in altering the boundaries and redistributing the seats in a manner that will be fair to the population at some future Session. When the inequality arises we will have no difficulty in dealing with it. But at this moment we have to look at things as they are, to the Census that has just been taken; and we find that the hon. gentleman, under pretence of equalizing the constituencies, proposes to create in one riding of Bruce a constituency with a population of nearly 25,000, and in another riding a constituency with a population of 17,000, a difference of nearly 8,000. Now, what justification is there for this? None, except that the hon. gentleman sought to place a great majority of the Reformers of the three ridings in one riding. I say that the proposition under consideration is a monstrous one. It is unjust. It seeks to give to a minority of the electorate in the county of Bruce, two out of the three representatives, and the tenacity with which the leader of the Government and the hon. gentleman who represents South Bruce, adhere to the division that has been made, the care with which they seek to protect the Conservative majority in the north from being turned into a minority, show what the real object is that arrived at by this measure. I do not believe this measure will succeed in accomplishing the object the hon. gentleman has in view, because I have a better opinion of human nature than the hon. gentleman. I do not believe that men are as base as he assumes they are. I do not believe that every member of the Conservative party, because he approves of the general policy of the Administration, is so base, so cowardly, as to seek to secure the control of the Government when he believes the majority of the people do not favor it. There are men opposed to us, who are ready to engage in manly warfare; they are not corrupt followers ready to butcher the wounded and plunder the dead. When the hon. gentleman makes this proposition and undertakes to defend it by such arguments as have been advanced by the hon. member for South Bruce, who knows right well what his object was, and that so far as an Act of Parliament can secure their election, they have undertaken to pass an Act of Parliament with that object. But I believe there is a sufficient number of honest men in the Conservative party to defeat the hon. gentleman's scheme, and I am glad to think so, because it would be a most disastrous thing if a measure of this kind should be approved by the majority of the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this measure is not going to succeed, and is going to have all the effect the hon. gentleman predicts, why does he object? Why do they make such a row about it? But there is no satisfying the hon. gentleman. We tried to meet his proposition half way, to the extent of Port Elgin, then my hon. friend from South Bruce makes a further suggestion, and the hon. gentleman had the unparliamentary weakness of attacking him for stating his opinion, and the hon. gentleman stated that I was acting as his agent.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong there. The hon. gentleman has no right to talk that way. It is not right to use the language he did a little while ago. Using that kind of language is not the way to get on in Parliament or out of Parliament, or to increase the respect of the members in Parliament for each other, or of the people outside for their representatives. It is only the violence of a weak nature, of a womanish nature, a disposition to scratch and bite; nothing can be more unmanly, nothing can be more weak, and it is rather a libel on the ladies to say it is feminine, but it leans that way.

Now the hon. gentleman says we want representation by population. But they do not really want it. They want, instead of giving the Grits, that the Tories should be hived, that is all. Then my hon. friend behind me says: "Let us go half way, there is an inequality of population and we will give you Port Elgin." That is his proposition, and he is quite at liberty to move it. We will give you half Saugeen, and you won't accept it. You won't have anything but just your own way. You are not seriously in favor of representation by population, nor will you accept it, nor even an approximation to equality, but you want simply to give the Tories. The hon. gentleman says that it is a mistake to look into the future in readjusting the representation of Canada, that we must take the present population. The hon. gentleman did not say so when Algoma got a representative, or when Muskoka got a representative. That was accepted on the ground that there was a rush of immigration to those two sections—accepted by the whole House, and the result showed it was right. Muskoka, which had 8,000 inhabitants in 1872, has nearly 30,000 in 1882. And so it will be in the north riding of Bruce. My hon. friend has truly said that there has been a large influx of population. The Census shows that the increase of North Bruce has been much larger than in any other part of Bruce. When the railway which is rapidly approaching completion, reaches Warton that county will be pretty well settled, for it is now settling rapidly. The hon. member for North Bruce, who was present at a deputation which came down to see me during the present Session, said that the people were going in there so rapidly that the licenses to cut timber which had been given to Cook & Co., must be stopped in order to prevent the deterioration of their farms. That was this very Session—not for the purpose of re-arranging the representation, but in the interest of the settlers. He stated there was a great influx of population there, and that the railway was going to increase it; but as North Bruce was very large in territory, and was a broken land, not continuously fertile, that the most valuable part would be the timber, and if the timber were cut by the lumbermen, the company that had got the licenses, the land would be so deteriorated that further influx would be arrested. The proposition that has been made is not acceptable to the hon. gentleman, but we cannot help it; therefore we will take it as it is, for the present anyway.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As I understand hon. gentlemen opposite, they object to this particular clause because it gives the political minority in the county of Bruce a majority of the seats. Well, Sir, the answer of the hon. First Minister is sufficient to that. But if that were not so, we have a capital precedent to justify even a proceeding of that kind, a precedent which hon. gentlemen opposite, at any rate, did not complain of. It is drawn from the legislation of that body where Reform principles find their most perfect illustration, I mean the Legislature of Ontario presided over by Mr. Mowat. I find that, according to their Readjustment Bill, but of the territory of fifteen constituencies which returned Conservatives in the Session of the Legislature of 1871 to 1875, twelve of those thirteen were so readjusted as to return supporters of the Government. That is not all. I find in those particular constituencies the Conservative votes polled at the preceding election, were 13,677 and the Reform votes 13,611, some sixty-six less, and yet they readjusted those constituencies so that they gave from that lesser number of Reform votes, nine out of thirteen representatives. The hon. gentleman comes here and tells us that in the readjustment of the representation of the constituency, where there is in one portion of it a large unoccupied territory, which with railways running into that territory and the improvements going on in that country, is certain to become largely populated in the early future, the result of this measure, so far as it relates to that