

ment, if it is a policy of tribute as against personal service, if it proposes to place Canada in the position of the dependencies of ancient Rome—compelled to pay tribute but not allowed to bear arms—the people are entitled to pronounce upon it at the polls by pronouncing upon the men who make the proposal.

May I say a word in regard to the question of Imperial sentiment in Canada? We are Imperialists because we believe that the power and prestige of the Empire is to us the guarantee of liberty and justice and fair play. Is it to be denied that we recognize these facts because some of us were born across the sea in foreign lands or even across the international boundary line in the United States? On what grounds are we to appeal to the loyalty of these people who come from continental Europe and from the United States except on the ground that the maintenance of the British flag means liberty, means justice and means fair play? And how are we to impress that idea upon our fellow citizens, these new subjects of the King? Is it by telling them that they are disloyal to the Empire because they do not understand it? May I suggest that the way to impress these people with loyalty to the Empire is to teach them loyalty to Canada, to build up in their minds a Canadian sentiment. In that way alone can we depend on getting their adhesion to Imperial sentiment. But if we are to teach them that Canada, the only country under the British flag that they know, is a country of no account, whose people have no confidence in themselves, who will not even defend themselves, I ask you how can we expect to build up an Imperial or Canadian sentiment under those circumstances. Give these people the knowledge that what is theirs is theirs, that the responsibility rests upon them to do their share in maintaining that liberty, that justice and that fair play which they enjoy and appreciate, and I submit that that is the way that we will build up in them the sentiment of Canadian patriotism and of Imperial loyalty.

Speaking more directly to the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), it has already been stated to the House that under the British North America Act it is required that there shall be a redistribution of seats in this House after each census. The census was taken in 1911; it is now 1913. The results of the census are known, the facts are absolutely at the disposal of the Government, there is no reason why that redistribution which is a part of the charter of our country should not take place at this session of Parliament, except the political exigencies of the Government and they are determined to force their measures through the House without the country being represented according

to its rights under the constitution. We have the word of the Prime Minister that it is not the intention of the Government to provide for redistribution at this session. At the present time the House of Commons has 221 seats. According to the census of 1911 the House of Commons should have 234 seats, an increase of thirteen members. If this increase of membership were evenly distributed throughout the country, even then those communities which are entitled to increased representation should have it, and no matter of the convenience or exigencies of the Government of the day would justify the Government in refusing these people their rights under the constitution. But that is not the condition, the condition as it is to-day, shows that a certain part of the country, that part west of the great lakes, is entitled not only to that increase of thirteen seats but, under a redistribution as called for by the constitution of Canada, it is entitled to an increase of twenty-two seats.

Mr. WILCOX: How many seats would it have been entitled to in 1910 when the Naval Service Act was passed?

Mr. OLIVER: The same number that it has now because if the hon. member will take a pencil and paper and figure out he will find that the census of 1911 was not taken until the year after 1910.

Mr. WILCOX: But the vote for the passing of the Act in 1910 would not be a fair representation of the people of this country if the vote on this Bill is not a fair representation.

Mr. OLIVER: The only thing wrong with my hon. friend's argument is that it is contrary to the statement of the constitution and I will leave him to settle it with the constitution.

It is a fact that the greater proportion of the increase of the population of this country during recent years has taken place in the country west of the great lakes. At the present time that part of Canada is represented in this House in the proportion of one-sixth; it is entitled on the census of 1911 to be represented very nearly in the proportion of one-quarter. The Government which dares to defy the constitution and the people of this country in its refusal to give that portion of Canada the representation to which it is entitled, should be condemned by every honest man in Canada as a government that is not playing fair with the people. It is true that redistribution would reduce the representation of the eastern portion of the country, but do my hon. friends delay a redistribution because of that? They do not dare to say so, although that may be the reason. It makes no difference whether the