

the purpose of insuring the election of Mr. M. C. Cameron. The township of Tuckersmith had a very large majority of Liberals, and by taking it from the constituency in which it had been placed in the Redistribution Bill, following the principle of representation by population, it was intended to secure the election of Mr. Cameron. That Bill was introduced by a private individual. It had nothing whatever to do with the principle of the redistribution of seats after the decennial census. It was very properly thrown out in the Senate. The other Bill to which I have already referred, which was introduced by hon. Mr. Mills, was rejected by the Senate as not being in accord with the constitution under which we live. I moved the resolution to reject it, and though I did not at the time declare it unconstitutional, or claim that the Senate had not the power to change or amend it, I did contend that the constitution never contemplated any such measure. I contended that the constitution provided for the redistribution of seats after every decennial census, and that to attempt to interfere with the representation, on any other occasion, would be doing something never contemplated by those who framed and passed the British North America Act.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—When the Conservative party were passing the Confederation Act, why did they put the Maritime provinces in such a position that they are losing their representatives in the House of Commons?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—My hon. friend knows very well that the matter is governed by the constitution, and that representation in the House of Commons is based on the unit of the province of Quebec. If the hon. gentleman will tell me why the population of Quebec is increasing faster than the population of New Brunswick I might explain his question.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—It is because we are raising very clever men in the Maritime provinces, and they are going West.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am sorry to say that in the redistribution which is to take place this year, Ontario loses four members. The Tuckersmith Bill was rejected because it was an interference, by a private member, with legislation which should emanate from the Government of the day. You might tinker with every constituency in the country if a thing of that kind were permitted.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

On May 19, 1899, Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced (on behalf of Mr. Mulock who was absent) a Redistribution Bill, the avowed object being to correct certain 'injustices' caused by the Acts of 1882 and 1892. This Bill was read a third time in the Commons. On the second reading in the Senate Sir Mackenzie Bowell moved the following amendment:

That it be resolved that it is inexpedient to proceed further with the Bill now under consideration inasmuch as it is provided by section 51 of the British North America Act that the representations of the provinces in the House of Commons shall be readjusted upon the completion of each decennial census subject to and in accordance with the rules in the said Act set forth, and as the next decennial census will be under the provisions of the Confederation Act be taken in 1901, a readjustment of constituencies in the Dominion made previous to such census being taken would, in the opinion of this House, be a violation of the spirit of said Act.

The amendment was carried on a vote of 36 for to 14 against. The motion for the second reading of the Bill was lost on the same division reversed, and, therefore, the Redistribution Bill was defeated.

(July 20, 1899, Senate Hansard, column 897.)

Why this question is dragged in at the present moment I am at a loss to know, unless it is for the purpose of preparing the country and the Senate for the rejection of a Redistribution Bill, no matter what its character may be.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex)—No, no.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—And according to the whim of those who would take objection to it, for the purpose of defeating the measure.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex)—The hon. gentleman must know I never suggested such a thing.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It would have been quite time enough for the hon. gentleman to discuss the question when the Bill is before us, but he predicated his remarks on the assumption that the Bill was to be so vicious in its character that he wanted a ground upon which to educate the people, if possible, on the propriety of rejecting a Bill of which they know nothing whatever, and cannot know until it comes before the House. I readily admit, from my experience—and every member of this House who thinks over the matter for a moment will agree—that there are difficulties surrounding any government in the redistribution of seats. Take the province of Ontario at the present moment—I speak of that province because I live there. We are to lose four seats. The first thing to be done is to decide what portion of the province is to be deprived of