

markets of the world. If other terminal elevators can be equally successful we can afford to have a few more. I am glad to notice that some provision has been made, or some inquiry made as to the necessary conditions for improving the safety of ships at sea. The terrible disasters such as occurred on the upper lakes last November, would be partially relieved, or their serious consequences would be materially reduced, if our upper lakes were properly lighted. That has not been done yet. It is one of the duties of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to see that it is done quickly. The loss of two or three hundred lives, and millions of property, is a serious matter. We had some time ago a great difficulty in navigating the St. Lawrence, from Montreal say to the Gulf, because of inadequate lighting of the route. Now it is said to be as safe to go by that route, either by day or night, as to sail in the open sea. If by the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money, or any money that would be proper under the circumstances, we would render sailing in autumn or at any season of the year less dangerous to life and property, I think the department should apply itself to that purpose. The matter is pressing, it is urgent, and should be attended to without delay.

I notice that the Bill provides a morsel which might require some time adequately to masticate, or perhaps ultimately to digest, namely the redistribution of the constituencies which I think will affect nearly every province of the Dominion. We have had no indication yet as to how the redistribution is to be accomplished. We have had several redistributions, one every decennial census since 1872. Some of them were very bad. Some of them were very good. The worst that I ever knew was in 1882. My hon. friend from Hastings will pardon me for referring to him, but as he and I were opponents in the House, and I was a material sufferer from that redistribution, he cannot blame me for saying a word about it. I do not think anything could be worse than the form of the Redistribution Bill. I am not going to attribute it to political motives, but nevertheless it was a curious piece of legislation. Some forty or fifty constituencies were disturbed in their boundaries in order to add four seats to the representation in the province of Ontario. If any map-maker, or any man designing to give four seats to the province of Ontario could work it out and apportion

the four seats among forty or fifty constituencies it would be one of the greatest achievements which I know of in legislation. It was done. What was its purpose? It did not equalize population to any great extent. It kept a number of men from being elected who, under different conditions, would have been elected. It strengthened the Conservative party to a considerable extent. I doubt if any man in this period of history will defend that Redistribution Bill in any of its aspects. The last redistribution we had in 1903 was accomplished by a Committee of the House, the report of which was acceptable practically to the House, when the question was considered in its final stages. In the old country they had a Redistribution Bill in 1884, prepared by Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Granville, on one side, and Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote on the other side of the table, with some assistance from the government whips. They agreed upon the principle of redistribution and allowed a number of experts to work it out. No complaint was made as to the agreement between the leaders of the parties, nor as to the redistribution when it was made. There does seem some common sense in that method. There does seem some readiness to act upon principles of equity and justice. It seems a reasonable thing where the interests of both parties are equal, where the object to be attained is to get a fair reflection of public opinion, that the parties should agree to allow public opinion to express itself in as reasonable, and in as free a manner as possible; and that the power conferred upon the House of Commons should not be used to destroy the influence of one party or to magnify the importance of another. If this redistribution is accomplished as the last was in 1903, by a committee and reported to the House as such committees usually do, I think the Senate will have no trouble with that Bill. I would be exceedingly sorry if we had to revise it, which I do not think we would want to do, at all. It does not come within our purview. It is to a considerable extent a matter of domestic concern, and I should be exceedingly sorry if it were so badly done that our sense of justice would be shocked, that we would revolt at the idea of placing upon the statute book a Redistribution Bill that was not founded upon principles of equity and justice. There need be no fear of bringing any Bill, so founded, into this House. This Senate has rejected three Redistribution