

consideration that the number of our inhabitants is and must continue comparatively small, owing to the fact that we have no Crown lands, mines, minerals, or other resources sufficient to induce immigrants to settle here, and that we never can expect to become to any extent a manufacturing people in consequence of our navigation being closed for nearly half the year, and all trade and communication with other countries stopped.

In the same debate Mr. Pope said:—

Among these objections I may mention the principle of representation by population. A very simple calculation will show that the adoption of this as a standard would entitle the city of London to send to the British House of Commons no less than seventy representatives, and the city of Montreal in the Confederate Parliament would have a representation greater than that of this island. Its statistics warrant the belief that in a few years the population will be so increased by the influx of the tide of immigration that the island would lose in the halls of legislation even the small voice which she might raise at her entrance into the Union.

That is precisely what occurred, and I wish to express my respect for the prescience of those gentlemen. At the outset we have six representatives in a House of 184 members; we would now have only three in a House of 234 members, if this measure of redress were not granted. This matter of representation is a sore spot in Prince Edward Island. We are penalized on the one hand by the non-fulfilment of the terms of union in the matter of winter communication with the mainland, as the result of which we have lost population and been unable to develop; while on the other hand because we have lost that population an attempt is made to penalize us by decreasing our representation. The clause in the resolution is a wise one, and I cannot understand the opposition of the hon. member from British Columbia (Hon. Mr. Bostock). That province was granted an irreducible minimum of representation when it entered Confederation. With a smaller population than we have in Prince Edward Island, they were granted six representatives, yet the hon. gentleman raises an objection to Prince Edward Island retaining this present reduced representation. At the subsequent census the province from which my hon. friend comes had only a population of 60,000 and they retained their six. We retained our six, being still only entitled to five, showing that while the framers of the Confederation Act were in control they felt that it was only doing justice to us by allowing us six members. I ask any man of commonsense, why

S-56½

should we have been given six when we were only entitled to five at Confederation, if it was not understood in the terms of Confederation that we should have six. When there was re-arrangement after the census of 1881, when Sir John A. Macdonald was in control of the affairs of the country, he knew the arrangement and understanding at Confederation. Why should he still have left us with six members when we were only entitled to five? For the simple reason—no question about it—that he knew there was an error in the writing of the Federation pact. I would ask my hon. friend not to take exception to subsection 5 of clause 51, for the reason that it is designed to help the weaker province of the union and is designed to do justice to us, and to redress the grievance under which we have suffered for years; if you have other reasons for voting against this resolution, do not attack that provision. For my part, I think with my hon. friend from Victoria division (Hon. Mr. Cloran) that perhaps the West has been modest in its demands for representation, but we must remember that senatorial representation is supposed to guard the interests of the weak. In the United States we find that 'Little Rhodie' as the state is familiarly called, has a representation of two in the Senate, while in the House of Congress its representation is only one. The representation in the Senate in the first instance was designed to protect minorities and to segregate the people according to their interest. For instance the Maritime provinces were given a representation of twenty-four. You would imagine, to read that resolution that the Maritime provinces were simply Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. When we entered the union, Quebec was given twenty-four and Ontario twenty-four. Now it is designed to give the West, whose interests are altogether identical, as compared with the interests of the Maritime provinces, twenty-four, which representation was fixed on a basic line, and we have the first sample of this in the Act of the union of the states to the south of us, which was designed to protect the minority in those states.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I am surprised to hear the hon. member from Prince Edward Island complaining of the present Bill, because I think that if there is a province that might with reason complain of the present Bill, and of the changed con-