

was more present and therefore they did not need representation as badly as did rural people.

Then in 1892 the Liberals came up with the idea of a commission. Their idea was a commission of judges. This idea has been floating around the Canadian House of Commons ever since. Actually, when the Liberals got in power in 1896 they began to think about doing something about redistribution and for the first time they waived the change after the census. In 1899 they brought in a bill and this was the first adjustment apart from the census. This was the first serious proposal of an outside agency to look after redistribution. Their idea was that judges should be members of the commission because they not only had local connections and understood the counties but they were men of great integrity. The other place or the Senate tossed out these bills and the Liberals brought them back in again in 1900. Again the Conservative Senate refused to pass them. They claimed that this bill was a violation of the spirit of the British North America Act. So the Liberal government had to let it go until 1903 when following the census they brought in another representation act. At this time you get the very first serious provincial dispute. You begin to get the lobbies from the maritimes because Prince Edward Island was dropping drastically and New Brunswick was beginning to drop. So the provincial premiers or the provincial legislatures began to press for some sort of floor under their representation so that it would not sink away in relation to the tremendous growth that was taking place in the west. This came with senatorial floor of 1915.

The constitutional arguments at that time were quite complex. The main point that we need to remember is that the maritime provinces lost their arguments even though they carried them to the supreme court and then over to the privy council in Great Britain. The 1903 readjustment really came up with the idea that still prevails as far as redistribution is concerned, namely the principle that it should be settled by a House of Commons committee. Prior to 1903 the whole thing was settled by the government party. After 1903 there was a small special committee of the House of Commons which put the thing through. The first committee consisted of what we would call in slang "the big wheels". For example, Mr. Borden, who was the head of the opposition at the time was on it. Its members were almost all of cabinet minister or ex-cabinet minister rank. This principle of having representation settled by a committee of the House of Commons has continued right down until 1952 when, as

I said earlier, we had a repetitious continuation of the decennial hassle that comes up regularly and in the last redistribution in which the present Prime Minister figured so largely.

In 1923 and 1924, with the redistribution another idea was introduced into the House of Commons committee and that was that it should be broken up into provincial sub-committees and that the members in each province should form a committee or have representation on a committee that would determine the constituency boundaries and just how the division was going to be made.

The whole point in connection with this system of House of Commons committees is that there is really no principle at all involved and I think Mr. Norman Ward in his book "The Canadian House of Commons" at page 46, sets out the whole matter quite clearly as follows:

At the risk of repetition, it must be emphasized that harmony in the house committee guarantees nothing; as Mr. Mackenzie King has observed, in one of the shrewdest remarks of his long career, "anyone reading the *Hansard* report... must realize to how small an extent the redistribution being effected at the moment is based upon the foundational principle of the division of the various constituencies according to the general interest of the country as a whole." Although this statement was being applied specifically to the fiasco of 1933, it could be made with equal force concerning even the most peaceful of the eight redistributions which have occurred thus far.

It does not necessarily follow that redistribution by a house committee is always bad; but it is indisputable that redistribution has so far taken place with reference to none but the vaguest of principles. At one time or another in this contentious history, as we have seen, no less than four principles have been followed: the use of local boundary lines; the adoption of relatively large urban divisions; the establishment of compact divisions; and the equalization of population.

But one or more of these principles has always been applied in relation to the wishes of a majority in the House of Commons, and when it has been expedient not to observe a principle, it has been conveniently forgotten.

I see that I am approaching the end of my time. I have more material which I wished to present but I think I should cover the main representations which I believe we should keep in our minds in connection with the redistribution. If we set up an independent commission or an independent authority as recommended by this bill we should have some principles to give to the commission under which to operate and I suggest the first principle is representation by population.

It has been suggested to me by one of the gentlemen of the press gallery that you should develop a formula and I hope that hon. members will look at this bill. There was introduced in 1952 by the present Senator Power a bill respecting the division