

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman who now leads the House so ably, said on that occasion: "It was suggested that there was a clause in the Bill that it should not come into operation until the expiration of this Parliament."

HON. MR. READ—If the House of Commons had allowed that it would not have been objected to so much.

HON. MR. POWER—Perhaps not. Sir Alexander Campbell, continuing his remarks at that time, said:—

"It was suggested that there was a clause in the Bill that should not come into operation until after this Parliament, but that was pooh poohed, and he felt justified in saying that the object was—indeed the avowed object to take 200 votes from one constituency and give them to another, at a time when an election was imminent, or at least likely to take place. Take the case of Montreal and see how this would work; let us suppose 200 votes taken from Griffintown or Montreal East and added to the western division just before an election came on! Could anything be more unjust? He did not think there could, and when a majority was inclined to carry with a strong hand an arbitrary measure of this kind, that would have the effect of which he spoke, and which was contrary to fair play, good sense and sound reasoning, it was time for the Senate to interfere in a matter which so much concerned the people."

What is the duty of the Senate now? Hon. gentlemen are not proposing to interfere with one constituency, but they are proposing to interfere with fifty constituencies on the eve of an election.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Because we are required to do so under the Confederation Act.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentlemen are now prepared to do in fifty instances what they at that time condemned their opponents for doing in one instance. Further on in that debate Sir Alexander Campbell is reported as having said:—

"Now, supposing they took a warm interest in the west division of Montreal, what would be said if they took 200 votes from Griffintown, or if in Quebec they took 200 from Champlain, and gave them to the centre division? If such legislation was to be allowed, every person whose election was doubtful would be endeavoring to reconstruct his constituency, so as to make his seat safe. He hoped the Senate would do their duty to

the people of the whole country, by interfering and giving time for the sober second thought of the Commons, who, after they had got over their present flush of triumph, would feel more like dealing with the subject in a juster direction, and would not force on such legislation as this."

I only hope the hon. gentleman will view this matter—after having heard what he said in 1874, and presuming it was right—as we do, and will vote with us to throw out this Bill. The leader of the Government in the other House has declared that he still holds to the principle which he enunciated in 1872, and he enunciated briefly a further rule on the first reading of this Bill, when he said the object of this Bill was to equalize, as much as possible, the population in the constituencies of Ontario. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa has shown how he equalized that population. When the Bill was introduced in the other House, the leader of the Government stated in the beginning of his remarks all the changes that were necessary. He said that the County of Essex should be divided into two ridings; Lambton should be divided into two ridings; the two ridings of Bruce should be increased to three. That disposed of three of the additional seats. He then said the three ridings of Middlesex should be increased to four; the two Simcoes should be increased to three and the two Ontarios should be increased to three. These were all the additions that were necessary and according to the hon. gentleman's own showing all these changes are embraced in nineteen of the fifty-three sub-sections of this Bill, so that the other thirty-four sub-clauses are altogether unnecessary and are introduced for some object other than to carry out the equalization of the population and provide for the additional representation. This Bill, as has been very clearly shown by the hon. member for Ottawa, is not in accordance either with the principle enunciated in 1872—that municipal divisions were to be regarded—nor is it in accord with the additional principle enunciated in 1882—that the population was to be equalized. I wish to call attention to two or three of the many discrepancies in the Bill. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue said that the only objectionable feature in the measure was one that was introduced on the