

accept the changes in the boundaries of constituencies, I would have no objection to any other part of the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I am very sorry to hear the hon. gentleman say that. You cannot except the principle of this Bill from its details, because there is no particular portion of the Bill that you can oppose and feel that you have the essence of the measure, because the essence is spread over some 55 or 60 sub-clauses. There is just one point which I wish to say a word about at the start, which was suggested by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. He said that this measure had been carefully considered: now he did not tell us by whom.

HON. MR. AIKINS—By the members of the House of Commons, and by the Government.

HON. MR. POWER—If that is the case, the hon. gentleman is in error. This Bill, proposing to reconstruct the whole representation of Ontario, was read the first time on the 28th April. It was read the second time on the 8th May. There was no opportunity for reconstruction in that interval, and the House went into committee on the Bill, and it was forced through committee at a single sitting. Where was the time for consideration? There was no time at all. The same majority voted down every amendment that was suggested.

HON. MR. AIKINS—That may be, but still it was well considered.

HON. MR. POWER—We know how the Bill was considered. It is a matter that is quite well known to every gentleman of the House of Commons, at any rate, and I presume it is known to every member of the Senate, that during all the early part of this session, a committee of four members of the House of Commons, generally known as "the gerrymandering Committee" were incubating the details of this measure, and when they had their work done, as they thought, fairly well, it was introduced and read the first time. When the Bill was attempted to be read the second time it was found to be totally different from the Bill as introduced: in consequence of the alterations which had

been made in the Bill, the right hon. gentleman who introduced it had to withdraw the measure and re-introduce it. Now that is not the way they make changes of this kind in the old country. I find in May's Constitutional History, page 439, in reference to Earl Derby's Reform Bill, that when a change was to be made a Royal Commission was appointed to deal with the matter, and that Commission had to report to Parliament. The thing was done by a judicial body, and not such a committee as dealt with this measure. Now, I do not propose to go over the ground that has been so well covered by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, but I shall refer to one or two authorities which I think ought to have a good deal of weight with hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member from De Lanaudiere read the declaration of the present leader of the Government in 1872 when introducing the Redistribution Bill of that year. That right hon. gentleman the other night, when introducing this Bill, declared that he stood by the declaration which he had made in 1872. Now, in 1874 this question of the representation in the House of Commons came before the Senate, the circumstances being briefly these; by the Re-distribution Act of 1872 the township of Tuckersmith had been taken from one riding of the County of Huron and added to another. There were 406 electors in that township, and 330 of these electors petitioned Parliament to be put back where they had been before. The House of Commons passed a Bill to grant their request. Now that was a very small matter, and not one which endangered the liberties of the people or affected the possible fate of the Government, but let us see what the hon. gentleman who leads this House said then.

HON. MR. READ—Will the hon. gentleman explain why Tuckersmith should be represented by two members of Parliament at the same time?

HON. MR. POWER—It was not to enable them to elect two members.

HON. MR. AIKINS—Yes, they had elected one member and it was proposed to give them an opportunity to elect another.