

A STRAIGHT GERRYMANDER CHARGES HON. A. G. MACKAY.

**Leader of Opposition Gives
the Figures Supporting
His Contention.**

**LIBERALS MAKE
FIGHT IN HOUSE.**

**Premier's Boasted Honesty
Described in Debate as
Thimble-rigging.**

**Opposition Conducts Most Spirited De-
bate—Premier Has Not Stuck to
Principles Laid Down by Himself
—Fall Fair Faking and Pea-un-
der-shell Racket, Says Opposition
Leader—Country Butchered for
Political Advantage—Two Votes
for Toronto Electors, One for
Rural Voters.**

Never before during this session has the Liberal Opposition in the Legislature been seen to better advantage than yesterday afternoon and evening, when the strongest of fights was made against the Whitney gerrymander bill. The debate was opened early in the afternoon by the Liberal leader, Hon. Mr. MacKay, whose address was replete with force and logical argument. He took up the principles laid down by the Premier and showed clearly and unmistakably how Mr. Whitney had wandered away from them.

The Opposition leader centred his attack on the failure of the Premier to act upon the principle that at least the population of constituencies should be equalized. Admitting even that it was not possible in every instance to follow county boundaries, he conclusively proved that on the more basic principle, that the population of constituencies should be equalized, Mr. Whitney had not acted upon what he had declared to be his policy. He quoted constituency after constituency which had not been touched where the differences in population ran into thousands. Only where political advantage was to be gained had the cry of equalization been raised for the obvious purpose of gerrymander.

Particular emphasis was also placed upon the course pursued regarding Toronto, where electors were to be given two votes each, whereas the electors in the rural ridings would still continue to have only one. The time of redistribution was inopportune, claimed Mr. MacKay, coming as it did so long after a general census. The leader was followed by Mr. Sam Clarke (Northumberland), Colonel Atkinson (North Norfolk), Messrs. C. M. Bowman (Bruce), W. H. Hoyle (Ontario), W. K. McNaught (North Toronto), and A. C. Pratt (South Norfolk). The debate will be continued this morning by Mr. A. E. Hislop, subsequently Mr. T. H. Pres-

A Concrete Case.

"Let the constituencies of Peel and Cardwell be taken. They were constituencies where the county boundaries were not considered. In the 1901 census Cardwell had a population of 18,527. Take off Allandale, which had gone out by virtue of a special act and been added to Simcoe, leaving 17,473. The population of Peel was 18,032, or 559 more than Cardwell, from which the townships of Albion and Bolton had been removed, and by the bill placed in their own county. County boundaries were observed there, but not in other cases. What was the result? Taking off Albion, with 2,741, and Bolton, with 702, from Cardwell, a constituency was left with a population of only 14,030, while Peel had 21,475.

"I want to ask any honest man," said Mr. MacKay, "any man who pretends to be honest, if that is equalizing the constituencies? Why are two municipalities taken from the smaller and given to the greater? How can that be honestly defined as honestly endeavoring to equalize the population? Peel had 3 per cent. more population than Cardwell, and now it will have 50 per cent. From that which hath not, in so far as population is concerned, is taken about half that it hath. The reason is obvious. Right in the front row on this side of the House sits Mr. John Smith, the only man, it is supposed, who can hold Peel. This change turns over 150 Conservative votes, the battle-axe will fall on him, and that is the reason of the alteration.

"I would like the people of Ontario to perceive exactly what this means," proceeded Mr. MacKay. "I am willing that the people of the Province should judge of the boast which comes so often from the Premier: 'Honest enough to be bold, and bold enough to be honest.'"—Hon. A. G. MacKay.

ton (Brant) will offer an amendment to Toronto representation, and a further amendment will be proposed by Mr. J. A. Auld (Essex) with regard to his county.

To Hurry Through.

That it is the intention of the Government to finish the business of the session as quickly as possible was evidenced by the motion of the Premier at the morning session, which read:—

"Any committee of this House which has not concluded the business referred to it may continue to sit while the House is in session."

In moving the second reading of the bill to amend the pharmacy act, Dr. Smellie said it provided for regulation regarding the sale of cocaine. The bill specified, he said, that when doctors' prescriptions were presented to druggists the latter should retain the prescription, so as not to let the victim of the cocaine habit take that prescription to another druggist. Briefly, Dr. Smellie told that the cocaine victim never lost the craving for the drug. Dr. Jessop also favored the bill.

The following bills were given third readings: To preserve the forests from destruction by fire, Hon. Mr. Cochrane; to amend the forest reserves act, Hon. Mr. Cochrane; to supplement the revenues of the Crown in Ontario, Hon. Mr. Matheson; to amend the supplementary revenue act, Hon. Mr. Cochrane; respecting municipal securities, Hon. Mr. Matheson; to amend the act respecting Queenston Heights Park, Hon. Mr. Foy; respecting the city of Guelph, Mr. Downey.

Taking Premier's Argument.

In continuing the debate on the redistribution bill Hon. Mr. MacKay said his reason for submitting the resolu-

tion to make no change in old Ontario ridings at the present time was endorsed by the Premier in his finding that owing to the age and inaccuracy of the existing census it was not safe to depend upon the figures. He stated that in 1894 the cities of Ontario had been dealt with, when Toronto had been given four members, Hamilton two and Ottawa two. In 1902 certain changes had been made in New Ontario, as it was called, whereby additional representation was given to that part of the Province. Even now he agreed that it was advisable to increase the representation in New Ontario.

Continuing, Mr. MacKay went to Great Britain for precedents when a redistribution was brought into the House of Commons by a joint committee of both parties, and the leaders of both parties had adopted the principles laid down. The delimitation of the constituencies, continued the speaker, had then been left to an independent commission. In 1885 the principle of

one man one vote and one constituency one representative had been laid down in Great Britain.

"I thought, sir, we had arrived at that here long ago. The leaders in Great Britain arrived at it as far back as 1885," said Mr. MacKay.

Going Back on Policy.

Turning to the policy of the Conservative party, the speaker said that in 1874 their leaders had opposed the question of increased representation in the Province. In 1902 it was found that Conservatives in the House had taken a distinct stand. A bill had been brought in by the member for South Grey limiting the number of representatives to sixty. Just six years ago Conservatives had placed themselves on record as favoring just sixty members.

"The proper time to make a redistri-