

because, seriously, any one who has read the speeches of the gentlemen who have been named to represent the United States cannot by any possibility come to the conclusion that they are impartial jurists of repute. Whether they are jurists or not I do not know, but I think the United States would object if three gentlemen sitting here were appointed and designated as impartial jurists of eminent repute. We are citizens and civilians and capable, probably, of coming to as correct a conclusion as any lawyer but that is not the character of the men indicated by the treaty, and it is deeply to be regretted that the United States so far forgot their duty under the wording of that treaty as to make the appointments they did. They first laid down the principle in the treaty that there is a desire to maintain peace and harmony between those two great countries, Britain and the United States, and they immediately appoint three men who have expressed decided and positive views upon this question and call them impartial jurists. One of these gentlemen made a violent speech against the treaty itself. After an interview, if the public press is correct, with the President, he went back to the Senate Chamber and allowed the treaty to pass without any opposition. Whether it was part of the condition of his withdrawal of opposition that he should be one of the commissioners, of course I do not know, but we can draw our own inferences from the circumstances as they are presented to us.

The census has been referred to and we are told that we are to have a Redistribution Bill. The hon. mover of the Address is very sanguine as to the character of that Bill which is to be introduced. I must confess I have not the same confidence the hon. gentleman has, but I hope he may be correct. I notice that the Hon. Mr. Paterson, Minister of Customs, in his speech at the late North Ontario election, referred to this fact, and if he will only carry out the promises he made then I scarcely think any member of the present parliament will object to it. He said :—

It would be the duty of the present government to redistribute the constituencies during the present parliament, but it would also be their duty to see that is done in a fair, honest and equitable manner. To attempt by legislation to keep one party out of power was not in accordance with the principles of British fair play.

I am fully in accord with those sentiments and I hope the government will carry it out.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Another convert.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I notice that the premier made a statement of a similar character. He said :—

The objects of the government in introducing legislation shall be, first, to wipe out the injustices and abuses from which the Liberals in Ontario have suffered for twenty-one years, and next to devise a measure in such terms as to give no favour either to the party in power or to the party in the minority, but to devise a measure, which, whatever may be the question brought before the Canadian parliament at any time, shall make it certain that the views of the people shall upon every occasion prevail and the majority shall rule.

I repeat, in reference to that estimate I am fully in accord with the premier, but judging from the past and the pledges which were made upon the trade question and various other subjects before they came into power, and the subsequent gross violation of all of them, I have little faith in what they have promised now. I hope in the interests of the country I may be mistaken in that matter; if I am, you will find no one in this House more ready to acknowledge the fact than I shall be. I have a distinct recollection, however, of the speech made by a late member of the cabinet, the ex-Minister of Public Works, in Brantford when he was discussing this subject of redistribution, and he told his hearers there that he would 'fix them when the time came.' He may not be able to fix them now because he is out of the cabinet, but if he spoke for the cabinet at that time, we have a right to assume the government will carry out the threat he made. Then another gentleman said he would so redistribute Ontario that there would not be a Tory elected. I am very much inclined to think that no matter how the province is gerrymandered the hon. gentleman will not be able to accomplish that.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.—He was probably thinking we would have to have the Tories as our predecessors did the Grits.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—My impression is that it is impossible for even the Secretary of State, whatever his inclinations and desires may be, to so have them as to accomplish that object. They are too sensible; they know what the con-