

make up, that I shall secure my election. If I were only placed on a par with my opponent I would not care who opposed me. I am not discouraged at the loss of this 118 votes. I have every confidence that the people will frown down this gerrymandering scheme, and return me by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BERGIN. Among the many complaints against this measure, I do not find any as to the wiping out of the counties of Stormont, Cornwall, Niagara and Lincoln. I find, on the contrary, that the hon. leader of the Opposition thinks that Eastern Ontario has too many representatives still, and that the Government have been more than just to it. He seems to think, as has been always the case with his party, that Western Ontario should have everything. Now, we desire to be just to Western Ontario, but it is impossible that we can have a strictly accurate distribution of members according to population. The Bill does not pretend to such a distribution. The hon. leader of the Government has done the best he could under the circumstances. I know he desired to preserve those old constituencies of Cornwall and Niagara with their old historic surroundings, but it was impossible. Cornwall and Stormont were too small, and being adjacent constituencies, they could not be very well annexed to any other; and, therefore, although we lose a representative in Eastern Ontario, to which we were honestly entitled, we submitted with good grace, not complaining like gentlemen opposite. We feel, after all, that the question is not whether this or that constituency has a representation, but whether Ontario has the full quota to which she is entitled under the British North America Act, which provided for an increase of the representation of Ontario proportionate to the increase of her population at the end of each decade. The hon. Premier was obliged to submit this Bill, which I believe entitled it to the confidence of this country. Some of its opponents say the constituencies are too large, others that they are too small; that some are too Conservative; that others are too Grit—that the Grits are hived in some constituencies and entirely driven out of some others. I can hardly imagine what would satisfy them. If we give them a good Grit riding they growl, and if we do not give them one they howl, and when they are heard they do not cease to complain. We have been hived in the county of Stormont, and I am proud of it. We have not only a great county, but a good old loyal Conservative constituency in Stormont, settled by old United Empire Loyalists, like my grandfather, who came from the valley of the Mohawk to live under the British rather than under the American flag. And if the hon. Premier has so arranged the constituencies in Ontario, that they shall be loyal—that they shall return loyal members—men not disposed to vote for Independence, or look to Washington—then, I say, he deserves the thanks of the country and will long live on its merits. Not content with finding fault with the distribution of seats in Ontario, the hon. leader of the Opposition, as he always does, endeavored to provoke sectional strife. He, like many others, who, when they get into difficulty, are anxious to get others into similar difficulties, would tear up by the roots the old Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Although there is no color of law in it, no reason whatever, except that misery loves company, he would do all the injury he could, when he could not get power himself, to those who would not assist him to get power. He would disturb the constituencies in those different Provinces without rhyme or reason. Because we refuse to re-adjust constituencies in New Brunswick, Quebec and Nova Scotia, where nothing of the kind is asked for, and where they are not compelled under the law, to have any redistribution, he calls, with a coolness, that even in him is remarkable, upon the representatives in those Provinces, if they are honest men, to assist him in voting down

Mr. TROW.

what he calls an infamous measure. I shall not go over the list of adjectives with which that hon. gentleman favored us in the discussion of this Bill, as he always does in discussing every measure. If I were to go over the history of that hon. gentleman, I could show that he has been guilty, to use his own words, of as mean, low and dishonest political acts, as any man who ever sat in this Parliament. I said a while ago, that it is hard to satisfy those hon. gentlemen. Under the law, they have four new seats, and by the wiping out of Cornwall and Niagara, two other seats, making six in all. If I read this Bill aright, these six new seats have been given to them. I would like to know if they had the power, would they hand over generously the six new seats to us. Far from it. Those who read the history of hon. gentlemen opposite and know how they gerrymandered this country through the instrumentality of the Premier of the Local Government, Mr. Mowat, know that they cannot be honest in their professions when charging us with gerrymandering. We know that the Premier of Ontario always consulted the leaders of the Liberal party in the Federal Government, and that everything he did was done, as it is now, after consulting with them; and we never heard they complained, because he arranged the constituencies so as to give them a majority. If I remember aright, they took thirteen Conservative constituencies in 1874, and gerrymandered them into nine Grit and four Conservative constituencies in the Lower House, yet we did not hear a word from hon. gentlemen opposite about the wrong that was then done. Everything is right when it is done in the interests of the Liberal party; but if not, everything is wrong. With their usual modesty they did not speak so much for the Liberal party as for Ontario. One would suppose that those forty or fifty gentlemen represented Ontario. They are not Ontario; they are only the Liberal party from Ontario. Yet when they are required they presume to say that Ontario is required. If, as has sometimes been the case during the consideration of this Bill, hon. gentlemen opposite had their complaints listened to by the right hon. Premier, and their requests granted in every instance, they would still turn around and whine. We had an instance of an hon. gentleman complaining that Torbolton was added; he would have preferred Huntley. The next day the hon. Premier acceded to his request by taking away Torbolton and giving him Huntley. What a row there then was. It was the most unjust act that ever was perpetrated. They complained about the village of Exeter and about the village of Saugeen—again the Premier was willing to accede to their request; but no, they were not satisfied. Had they supposed he would not have granted them there would have been no end to their complaints. There is another question I would like to put to the hon. leader of the Opposition. Suppose—and I admit it is the most improbable thing under the sun—that, through any misfortune, so dire a calamity should befall this country as that the hon. gentleman should be returned to power at the next election, would he pass an Act repealing this Bill and placing the constituencies in the same position in which they were before? Not at all. He would say: Ontario is all right; Sir John made a terrible mistake, and I made a mistake; the country was sound after all. This Bill up to 1892 would be kept in full force; not a change would be made in the constituencies. He finds it convenient to forget that, in 1872, the Liberal party denounced what they called then the gerrymandering Bill, just as fiercely as they denounce the present Bill, yet we had the spectacle the other night of that hon. gentleman moving an amendment which actually provided that the measure of 1872 was a just and honest measure, and his complaint is that we are not leaving the constituencies in the position in which they were in 1872. If anything could show want of political honesty more strongly than that I would like to hear it. I do not intend at any length to follow the statements—I