

chewan, which provinces would stand to lose seven seats. I maintain that it would be wholly unfair to have a redistribution based on that situation.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) asked about Ontario. As the minister knows in his city of Welland, and as I know in the city of Toronto, large numbers from those provinces came to work in our industries. However, the population of the province did not go up as much as one would have thought it would considering the ingress of people from outside. The fact is that Ontario had 145,000 in the armed services, which was 40 per cent of all those in the services in 1941; Quebec had 17 per cent, and the other provinces had lower percentages. Because of the dislocation of population caused by those working in war industries and the dislocation of population through enlistments it would be unfair to redistribute seats on the basis of the census of 1941.

At one time our American cousins were in the very same boat. This is not a new thing because they have gone through the same experience. However, they handled it in a different way. They took a census in the United States in 1920, and had reapportionment of congressional seats taken place at that time it would have resulted in a number of states losing some of their representatives in congress. They refused to reapportion their seats, and I should like to quote what was said before a committee of the house of representatives which was set up to deal with the apportionment. This shows why reapportionment did not take place in 1920. One of the senior ranking investigators said this:

Mr. Rankin: Let me make this statement for the benefit of members of the committee. I do this because I, more than any man alive, am responsible for the failure to reapportion congress in accordance with the 1920 census. That census was taken in the winter time, which was the first time such was done. At the time, it was taken many of the farmers were more or less scattered, it was hard to find them, and therefore the census, in my opinion, was incomplete.

That is just the situation that prevailed when our census was taken in 1941; many had moved away.

Again, it was taken when we were just emerging from the world war and when hundreds of thousands of former soldiers had not returned to their homes.

As a result, if we had reapportionment according to that census, many agricultural states would have lost a portion of their representation, and a very large portion.

That is the same thing we are up against here. Because of the war two western provinces lost a large part of their populations.

Following what they did in the United States, we should not have redistribution. They did not reapportion until after the 1930 census and in the meantime the population of the United States had increased by 30,000,000 from 1910. Were they unfair in not reapportioning? They did not think so. They had some consideration for those men who had not yet returned home by 1920 when the census was taken following the great war. They had consideration for the farmers who had gone to work in war factories.

Everyone in this House of Commons can read that the number employed in war factories was 1,021,000, according to "Canada at War", for 1945. Those people came from everywhere. I know that many went to the United States, because in 1941 that country was not at war and they paid higher wages. I am trying to show the house that we had the same condition here that prevailed in the United States when they refused to reapportion their congressional seats in 1920. They waited until 1930 before they did that. I consider that that was fair play; that was the right thing for them to do.

Someone asked about Ontario. As I said, the enlistments from Ontario were 145,000 in 1941, and this materially affected Ontario's population. Otherwise we would have advanced much more. These men were followed by many of their wives and, in some cases, their families and that affected the population of the province. It is for these reasons that we should not go on with redistribution.

As was said so well this afternoon by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), so much so that I do not need to say much about it, if the government proceeds with this they will be opening the door for other violations of the constitution if and when some rabid majority gets into power, as may some time happen, and determines to change the British North America Act. Supposing such a majority wanted to change section 92, subsection 12? Subsection 12 of section 92 deals with:

The solemnization of marriage in the province.

The provinces have control of that now, but there has been agitation for the Canadian government to have more control over marriage. Marriage is a contract. Can you change it just as you like?

Section 95 pertains to agriculture and immigration. It says:

In each province the legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the province, and to immigration into the province.