

tuency. The Bill is giving a constituency to the city of Toronto which it had not before. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) made a strong appeal to me. He stated that I could do almost anything in this House. I cannot; that would be too much, but with his help, perhaps, I can do something and if my hon. friend will second this proposition I will move:

That the following words be added to the amendment 'that section 54 of the schedule be stricken out and that the representation of the city of Toronto shall continue to be four as it is at present.'

Mr. CLARKE. If my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will pass the amendment over I will give it my most serious attention; but surely, after what has been so forcibly and frankly stated by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) there can be no argument as against the fair and reasonable proposition which he presents. Does the right hon. gentleman know that his four colleagues who surround him represent Ontario constituencies, the united population of which is less than 90,000, actually 89,096, with a unit of representation for these four counties of North and South Oxford, North York and Brant of 22,274; that these are old, well, settled, solid counties where the rural population is not increasing to any extent, but rather where the rural population is decreasing; that this district of Haliburton and Victoria has a larger area than probably the whole four counties, and that notwithstanding its great area and its population of 38,511—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What are the four counties?

Mr. CLARKE. North Oxford, South Oxford, North York and Brant. I will give the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) the population and if I am wrong he can correct me. These are the populations of the constituencies represented by the Minister of the Crown, and here is my hon. friend (Mr. Vrooman) appealing that Victoria and Haliburton with a population 16,000 larger than the average population of these four constituencies, should have two members. Victoria and Haliburton has a population of 38,511, against an average population of 22,274 in the others. This county is one of the sparsely settled districts in Ontario, and it directly comes under the principle laid down by the right hon. gentleman the other day. But hon. gentlemen opposite have to-night laid down the new principle: 'What we have we'll hold.' That is enunciated now as the guiding principle of the majority of the redistribution committee. The right hon. gentleman is anxious that the city of Toronto which has been so scandalously treated by this redistribution committee, should be deprived of the additional member which it is pro-

posed to give it. Would there be any justice in that? Since 1891, 64,000 people have been added to that city, and the unit of representation for the whole province is 25,383, but only one additional member is given Toronto for an increased population of 64,000. Would the right hon. gentleman seriously propose that the unit of representation for Toronto should be 52,000 and for the rest of the province of Ontario only 25,000? The right hon. gentleman says that nobody seems disposed to give up his seat in order that an additional member may be given to Victoria and Haliburton. The responsibility for redistributing the representation of Ontario rests with the government, and the hon. member (Mr. Vrooman) has made out a strong case. The right hon. gentleman ought to assume the responsibility of providing an additional member for these united counties, even if he is obliged to take a member from some other county. If Toronto was given the representation it is entitled to, we would have seven or eight members instead of five, and surely the Prime Minister is not serious in asking that the fifth member should be taken away, seeing that the unit of representation in Toronto under the proposed Bill is 42,000, while the unit for the rest of the province is 25,000. I trust that the Prime Minister will accede to the reasonable request made by the member for South Victoria.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have often stated that it is impossible to give an urban population the same representation as a rural population. Montreal would be entitled to more representation than Toronto, if we were to apply to it the principle laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke). If we did apply that principle to Montreal, instead of having six members it would have at least perhaps twelve members. If we did that in Montreal we would have to wipe out of existence several constituencies in Quebec which would have the same objection to being decapitated as have the rural constituencies in Ontario. We could have done much more in the case of Montreal. Without interfering at all with the rural constituencies, we could have taken the surplus population of Montreal and added it to the adjacent rural constituencies, so that at least two of the members who sit in this House; my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard); would have to fight for their lives, if they would not have been wiped out of existence altogether. We did not do that, we would not take advantage of our position. In the case of Victoria and Haliburton, if we gave it another member, we would have to take him from somewhere else, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will take the responsibility of saying that we should take that member from one particular place or another, we may consider the matter. I do not say that we would