

the last war, a million and a quarter men had to leave the central provinces for the United States, in order to earn a living. What did they care about representation in parliament; and what does the average member have to do with the affairs of the country at the present time? He has very little.

What happened when the last census was taken? It was taken at a time when thousands of men were out of the province of Ontario. They followed a different principle during the first great war. At the exhibition grounds in Toronto, in the Niagara district and up at Camp Borden they had 65,000 troops, all from that area. That, however, was changed in the last war. Then the government said, "We shall have our artillery at Petawawa and Winnipeg; we shall have other branches of the army down by the sea, and we shall have another part of the army right out at the west coast." The result was that young people from the city of Toronto had to go all over Canada, and they were not included in the census of 1941. I also know that in the constituency I represent and in the constituency of Eglinton, where I live, many people were left off the list. I do not believe anyone called at my home at all, and there were many similar complaints in regard to the method of taking that census. If the government want to do the thing for representative purposes, let them start over again and do it right; a recheck as it were.

At the time of the baby bonus I had before the house a bill which was debated when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was present, which suggested a real reform, to enable a referendum on matters of great national public importance like this. It was like the reform bill of 1834 in England, under which the agricultural and industrial classes of the mother country obtained proper representation, after a great fight. Here we have a resolution of the Minister of Justice which has grown out of the motion of a private member. It is a political bill. It is not in the interests of the constitution or of real parliamentary representation. It is a half-baked scheme which will lead to more disunity than anything else. You have to see the cause and effect in the country. Look at the improvements which have taken place in the province of Ontario, and for that matter in all the provinces. Consider what has been done to improve transportation since the first census was taken in 1871. Look at all the farming constituencies around the city of Toronto. They are practically urban constituencies. York North is right at the end of a bus line at Havergal college. That is the

[Mr. Church.]

case with York North, York East, York South, Peel, Halton and all the constituencies adjoining Toronto. It is the case around Hamilton, Guelph and London, right on up to Sarnia and Owen Sound. It is the case with the constituencies adjoining the great city of Montreal, the city of Quebec and other large centres throughout the country. What has been the reason? Good roads; good transportation; cheap light and power; rural electrification, and so on. These things have changed the whole situation as far as the census is concerned, and former rural ridings are now suburban. Let us have real representation by population. That was a good doctrine in the days before confederation, a clear Grit doctrine of representation by population, but the people are having their eyes opened in regard to what this parliament is doing. They had the same sort of discussions in Edmund Burke's day, when he was a member of the house and laid down the duties of a member of parliament, which is the law to-day. Let me read a few paragraphs from what he said, because he and others of similar views brought about real reform in the mother country. What does he say about the duties and functions of a member of parliament? This may be quite a myth now, but I was glad the Minister of Justice quoted it last year, as I have quoted it on many occasions:

Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you—to any man, or to any set of men living.

This was at a time when some of the electors of Bristol tried to instruct him as to the duties of a member of parliament and how representation there was to be conducted and carried on. He went on to say:

These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving, you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

What have we in connection with this bill? We have one legislature passing an act directing its representatives in parliament to do certain things here contrary to what the Minister of Justice set out in his admirable address. The right hon. gentleman always speaks with a great deal of force and with moderation.