

ness of the present Bill, especially when compared with the infamous gerrymander of Sir John Macdonald.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. METCALFE (Kingston) disapproved of the bill because it was an iniquitous measure framed to advance the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite, and not with regard to the interests of the province. The object of the bill was to save the life of the Ministry. (Cheers.) He charged the leader of the Government with deserting the city in which he was born, and weakly allowing his colleagues to carve up the city of Kingston. He paid an eloquent tribute to the character of the leader of the Opposition, for whose sake he believed the people of Kingston had returned him rather than for his own.

Mr. WIDDIFIELD did not undertake to reply to the last speaker, because he had only been trying to show the effect of a burlesque opposition. He (Mr. Metcalfe) objected to the Bill because it affected the city of Kingston and county of Frontenac, but he (Mr. Widdifield) showed that by the alteration both would be made nearer the unit of representation than they were before. Referring to the charges made by members opposite, that the measure was inconsistent, he said, even if this were true, from the standpoint of the hon. member for London, he ought to congratulate the Government. But he did not admit that it was true. Before Confederation the Liberal party contended for representation by population, preserving county boundaries. Therefore, in aiming at that now, they were consistent. So far as cities were concerned it was one of the principles of the Liberal party, that as they were more compact and therefore in a better position to bring their influence to bear upon the Government, the representation should be somewhat less than in the rural constituencies. Referring to the argument of the leader of the Opposition, that the Township of Uxbridge should be put into the South Riding of Ontario if the object had been to equalize the population, he said, that would not have brought the population any nearer to the basis. The North Riding, though smaller in population, was larger in territory and more sparsely populated than the South, and, therefore, would develop very much. Taking into consideration the probable rapid increase of East and West York from the overflow population of Toronto, it was not advisable to give those constituencies so large a population as some of the others. The hon. member for London, in referring to the inequalities of this measure, did not refer to the inequalities of the Dominion Redistribution Bill, confining himself to the four older Provinces which came into the union at Confederation. There were ten ridings under the Dominion Government's Bill, which were given a population of 41,633 on an average, and the limit of population under their Bill was less than under this one. He also found ten constituencies with an average population of only 9,000. In Ontario there were nine constituencies having an average population of 28,038, and nine of just half that population exactly. Then the hon. gentleman objected to the Bill, because the Government had not adhered to county boundaries, and instancing Monck he forgot to mention that the electoral constituency of Monck was created by Sir John Macdonald before Confederation. Cardwell was created at the same time and in the same way. That the object of this Bill was to do away with inequalities was shown in the case of Leeds and Grenville. The hon. gentleman next objected because the minority principle had not been adopted more generally. It was an experiment, and should be tried first. In view of the great increase in some of the western counties such a Bill was necessary, and after hearing the speech of the hon. member for London, who he assumed had put the arguments against the measure as strongly as they could be put, he was convinced that it was necessary, and that the distribution had been made as fairly and as equitably as possible.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) thought cities were deserving of their full share of representation. While the hon. member for London spoke in favour of urban representation generally, he did not call attention particularly to the treatment which Hamilton was receiving by this Bill. The population of that city was now in excess of 40,000, and it must be borne in mind that while rural constituencies were growing slowly Hamilton was growing rapidly. The representation it had might be sufficient now, but in ten years hence it would have 50,000 or 60,000 of a population, and it would be unjust to give it only one representative. He did not object to the additional members given in Algoma and the other constituencies, but he did complain that a place like Hamilton should be represented by a single representative. He had a right to complain and did complain. A city which had returned a supporter of a Liberal Government from the time of Confederation as Hamilton had done ought on political grounds to have had an additional member. He simply rose to give notice that at another stage of the Bill he would move an amendment proposing another representative. The Bill was all right so far as it went, and in support of this he referred to the shock which the Ottawa gerrymander had caused, while this Bill had been favourably re-

ceived in the country. Once more he expressed regret that he had been called upon to speak as he had, but he certainly could not have done otherwise than enter a plea for another member for Hamilton.

Mr. CASCADEN just wished to make two observations. He protested against the change in West Elgin, as it was calculated to sacrifice it to the Conservative cause, but he yet hoped the constituency would rise superior to this disadvantage and return a Liberal member. There was scarcely a riding within a radius of fifty miles of London which returned a Conservative member at present. Every constituency within the shadow of the Opposition leader sent a Liberal, and therefore, he said, he believed that his county would rise superior to its disadvantages.

The division was then taken on the motion for the second reading, which was carried as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Cook, Dill, Dowling, Dryden, Ferris, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gillies, Gould, Graham, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Hart, Laidlaw, McIntyre, MacKenzie, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Muster, Morin, Mowat, Murray, Pardee, Phelps, Rayside, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Sills, Snider, Waters, Widdifield, Young—46.

NAYS—Messrs. Baskerville, Blythe, Breerton, Broder, Carnegie, Clancy, Clarke (Toronto), Creighton, Denison, Ernatinger, Fell, French, Gray, Hammell, Hess, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, Lees, McColman, McGhee, McKay, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Mulholland, Neelon, Preston, Ross (Cornwall), White, Wilmot, Wood—35.

THE HIGH SCHOOL BILL.

The House in Committee on the High School Bill, Mr. Badgerow in the chair. Considerable discussion ensued upon the question of the distribution of the High School grant.

Hon. G. W. ROSS again explained the principles upon which the grant was divided, and showed generally that it was made to schools so as to encourage the schools trying to help themselves, and they would be encouraged to improve their equipment, and also the appearance of the grounds, average attendance, etc.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill as amended.

FIRST READINGS.

Hon. O. Mowat—To amend the Act about the employment of prisoners without the walls of county gaols.

Also—Respecting the property of insane persons in gaols.

Also—To amend the law for garnishing debts.

ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion for adjournment, Mr. MEREDITH stated that some information had come to him which led him to believe that there was the greatest cruelty practised at the Central Prison. He had been given to understand that prisoners were kept for forty days on bread and water. In view of this he hoped the Government would yield to the demand for an investigation.

Hon. O. MOWAT said the Provincial Secretary was not present, and in his absence he was not prepared to say anything about the matter.

The House adjourned at 11:15 p.m.