

Senate in the past as well as at present has always been non-partisan, and has acted on the principle which had been outlined at Confederation by Sir John Macdonald, Sir Alex. Campbell, and the Hon. George Brown. I was very much pleased to hear him say so, because the statement is such a contrast to the hon. gentleman's declarations when he was in the legislature of Ontario. At that time every province was asked by the Liberal Government of this country to pass resolutions condemning the Senate as a partisan body. I shall not take the time of the House reading the hon. gentleman's expressions when the motion was made in the legislature of Ontario, condemning the Senate, but it is interesting to contrast his views on that occasion with the views he expresses now. He has realized, at last, that a second Chamber is necessary, and that there is no ground for appealing to the Imperial Government to change our constitution.

I am quite sure the hon. gentleman did not intentionally mis-state the facts, but he left the impression on the minds of hon. gentlemen who did not know the facts, that the Bills affecting representation in the House of Commons, which the Senate had rejected, were the Redistribution Bills provided for by the constitution. Every case of the kind to which he referred had reference to Bills introduced in the Lower House by private members—Bills which were never contemplated by the constitution. The hon. gentleman connected my name with one of them. It is true that I moved the rejection of a Bill introduced in this House by the Hon. Mr. Mills, though I think he is mistaken as to the dates of the Bills that he mentioned. He made this remark:

This Senate has rejected three Redistribution Bills in its history—actually rejected them. A Conservative Senate did so, and no Senate can be more moderate in its views or more equitable in its opinions, judging from what we hear nowadays, than a Senate in which the Conservative party has a majority.

I have taken some little trouble since the hon. gentleman delivered his speech to look up some of these cases. The Bill to which my hon. friend referred more particularly, and to which he called my attention, was a Bill introduced in the House of Commons tinkering with the different constituencies, particularly west of Toronto, and some in the province of Quebec, on the pretense that in the redistribution of 1882 an injustice had been

done to these constituencies, and that the principle of representation by population had been disregarded. The hon. gentleman stated that the Redistribution Bill of 1882 had not been based upon population, and that in making the redistribution, we had changed some fifty constituencies. This he deprecated, at the same time contending that representation should be based upon population, and that the constituencies should be divided along county lines. If he will take the trouble to read my reply to the Hon. Edward Blake, upon a similar charge being made by that gentleman in the House of Commons, he will find the figures given of each constituency, showing that the principle of representation by population was followed as closely as possible. I contended then, and I contend now, that under our system it is not necessary to follow county lines. The great principles which govern the administration of Dominion affairs are not affected by the fact that a member lives on one side or the other of a county line. Where it was necessary to cross a county line, in order to equalize population it was done. It is another matter however, to do this in fixing the representation in the local legislature. In the legislature the local interest of each constituency is affected to a great extent by the county lines, and what will the House think of my hon. friend's position, when I state that in the redistribution which took place in Ontario, the very constituency which my hon. friend represents is composed of parts of not less than three counties, and that in making up the constituency county lines were abandoned. Yet he contends here that county lines should be followed in the redistributing of constituencies. However, he is following the old practice of his party, a practice which they have pursued ever since I have had any knowledge of parties in this country, of making great professions when in opposition for the purpose of catching votes, and pursuing an entirely different course when they get into power.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex)—
Order, order.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I could furnish many illustrations to prove the correctness of what I say. My hon. friend will remember that, at one time, we had before us in this House, a famous Bill known as the Tuckersmith Bill, the object of which was to take a particular township out of one riding and add it to another for