

bers of the house who agreed to deferring redistribution in 1943 I am not at this moment asking that another privilege of that kind be granted to western Canada. I believe that the proposal placed before the house by the government at the present time is fair, just, sound and constitutional.

The hon. member for Lake Centre has preached this afternoon what is in effect a new doctrine. In 1915 only one province, according to Doctor Skelton, took advantage of the privilege of appearing before the special parliamentary committee on amending the British North America Act, and his comments in the case of that amendment are as follows:

Object: To increase the number of senators and alter the main senatorial divisions.

Procedure: The procedure adopted was that the act was passed by the United Kingdom parliament following an address by the Senate and House of Commons of Canada. Prince Edward Island made representations before a House of Commons committee, which were not accepted. Other provinces were not consulted and made no representations. The suggestion was made in the House of Commons by Mr. O. Turgeon, now Senator Turgeon, that the provinces should be consulted, but it was not acted upon.

That is the position regarding the fundamental change which was made at that time.

I shall not attempt to answer the legal arguments of my hon. friend. I am not a lawyer and I leave it to the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and other lawyers in the house to deal with the legal aspects of this question. But the thing that presents itself to me is this. Is Canada a nation? Or is Canada merely a collection of individual provinces, each one willing to go its own way? That is the question which occurs to me. Is Canada to be another Balkan peninsula of warring states, or are we to build this great country into a nation? I say that arguments, constitutional or otherwise, such as we have heard this afternoon serve no useful purpose in promoting national unity in this country. Of course they undoubtedly reflect the point of view of certain sectional interests. It is not an unknown phenomenon for my ultra-imperialist friends of the Progressive Conservative party to be in secret alliance with sectional interests in one of the great provinces.

Mr. FULTON: Where are the frightened old women now?

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not frightened. I say the same thing in Ontario and Quebec and all over.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That will be a new experience.

Mr. COLDWELL: My hon. friend says, "That will be a new experience." I say the same thing in all parts of Canada. Perhaps

my hon. friend does not know that I have been followed by the same newspaper men right across Canada who found that I said the same things everywhere. I do not refuse to call this country Canada in this house and then, within a week, speak of the kingdom of Canada in the province of Quebec. So I say it is not a strange phenomenon because the same thing has been observed in the past.

If my hon. friend's argument of this afternoon were accepted it would result in the two provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan losing seven seats after the next election.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Not at all.

Mr. COLDWELL: Seven seats after the next election, because I am convinced of this, that it would be difficult indeed to get certain provincial premiers to agree to this proposal. Premier Drew of Ontario sees that Ontario now has—what is it?—seven or eight seats more than she is entitled to according to population. I give that just as an example. There might be other premiers who feel the same way about the matter. But in my opinion, to do justice to the western provinces, representation by population is the only basis upon which justice can be done.

We are told that we run the danger of the rights of minorities being lost. Is there a right of any minority involved in the resolution that is before the house? I would say there is, and that is the right of the minority to have adequate representation in this house as against the majority and against overrepresentation by one province.

My hon. friend quoted from a former leader of this movement, the late Mr. J. S. Woodsworth. I took down the page number he gave, but I am afraid he made an error in the number, or maybe I did not hear him correctly. The page which I think he gave was 1592 of *Hansard* for 1935. Mr. Woodsworth is not reported on that page, but that is immaterial. I will take it for granted that Mr. Woodsworth said that. But what I will add is that Mr. Woodsworth may have said that, and in logic he was sound, but in the matter of representation in parliament regional representation may be as important as population representation. For example, I believe that the northwest territories are entitled as well as the Yukon to a member in this house, because of the mining, trapping and other interests which are unrepresented here in the sense in which they should be represented. On the same basis, I believe the maritime provinces have a right to regional representation; and in spite of what Mr. Woodsworth said in 1935 my opinion would be that the