

policy of the Government, I will not deal at the present moment. It would not be fair to the Government, to myself, or to the House, to venture any criticism of that policy, whatever it may be, and we shall wait until it is presented to the House. I presume that the words put into the mouth of His Royal Highness have been duly weighed, and if so, there is only one conclusion to be drawn from them, and that is that the Government have no intention this session of introducing a measure of redistribution. There may be some reasons why the representation of these three provinces should be increased in the Senate—we do not know them. But there is a reason why the representation of those provinces in the House of Commons should be increased, and we do know it. The British North America Act provides that there shall be a census every ten years, and that after every census the representation of the provinces in this House shall be rearranged according to the figures disclosed by the census, upon the basis of population. There is no more important provision in the British North America Act, and I say to my right hon. friend, and to those who sit behind him, that there devolves upon them a constitutional and imperative duty to have this redistribution immediately—not next session, not the session after next, but during this present session. The British North America Act, in section 58, paragraph 5, dealing with the redistribution which must follow the census, provides as follows:

Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

It may perhaps be said, that it is sufficient to have this redistribution made before a general election, but that is not the interpretation which has been given in the past to this provision. The Act provides that the redistribution shall take place as soon as the figures of the census are known. And why? It is true that a parliament may continue for five years, but everybody knows that Parliament can be dissolved at any moment. It may be the will or the pleasure of the Governor General to dissolve Parliament at any time, there may be a crisis which may make this course advisable. Therefore it is necessary that the conditions under which elections must take place should be the same at all times. This has been the policy which has been followed after every census. In 1871, in 1881, in 1891, and in 1901, the redistribution took place as soon as the figures of the census were known. Why, then, this exception? What is the sinister design which exists in the mind of the ministry when they actually contemplate not having the redistribution during this present session? I

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

shall await, what the Government have to say on this important subject. I assume that they have to-day no intention of performing what is an important constitutional duty. If I am wrong I shall be glad to know it, and it will be my duty to apologize, but if I am right the Government may expect to hear of the question again during the present session.

There is one thing in regard to which the Government are silent, that is, as to their achievements—and for a good reason. When nothing has been done, of course nothing can be said. If it can be supposed of governments what is sometimes applied to individuals, that to each one is assigned an angel whose mission is to record his good deeds and his bad deeds, the angel of the present Government as far as good deeds are concerned, has had nothing whatever to do, his pen has been rusty, his page has been blank, and I must say that that angel has indeed had many causes to weep.

When the members of the Government were sitting on this side of the House, they were voluble and indefatigable preachers of virtue. The people took them at their word, believing that their deeds would correspond to their statements, but they have found that these men who were preachers can be little esteemed as performers. My hon. friend who sits opposite, when he was in the place I now occupy, used to deliver homilies on the necessity of having bye-elections on the same day when there were several vacancies at the same time. These homilies have been altogether forgotten. My hon. friend has had the opportunity during the recess of making practical application of his doctrines, but like the old moons, they have gone away—we do not see them any more. There were several vacancies, and several elections took place—I do not speak of the last, which was caused by the resignation of Mr. Monk, but of the others—and there was no reason why these elections should not have been held on the same day. But they were not brought on the same day, they were scientifically spaced with regular or irregular intervals so as to bring the greatest possible measure of success to devoted apostles of the Government.

In other matters I have to charge them with dereliction of duty of the gravest character. I have to say here and now that in the elections in Macdonald and Richelieu there were practices connived at by the Government, which would put to shame the worst record of Tammany Hall. The election in Macdonald was under the charge of my hon. friend the then Minister of the Interior, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). He stated in one of his speeches, and that speech was endorsed by