

ward Island, formerly its representation was six, now it is four and if you should have to reduce it to three or two it would be small comfort for the good people of Prince Edward Island to be told that by the law of mathematics they still had their same proportion. I think that it would be the more obvious and reasonable course for the government to defer action in order that all parties may be consulted to see if they would consent to such an arrangement. I throw this out, as my own idea, as a possible means of a solution of what might otherwise be a rather embarrassing question.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I think it would be better, rather than to wait until a difficulty like that referred to arises, to make provision so that it will not arise. This matter is a very important one, especially, as has been stated, to the people of the maritime provinces. We have already lost representatives for the reason that the original charter of confederation has been broken by subsequent Acts of the imperial parliament at the request of this parliament. Now, we are told that we should wait to see if we are to lose any more. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that there will be no population in Ungava and those portions of the territory that it is proposed to add to the province of Quebec. The Prime Minister is hardly in a position to make that statement. It has been stated by some, in regard to the last addition made to the province of Quebec, that the population would not be affected, that it was a sterile country. We have had others say that this was by no means a sterile country, that it was a country capable of maintaining a large population. If the country that was last added to Quebec is not of that character, what possible excuse is there for this country going to the expense of building the new Transcontinental Railway through it? We are building an immense railway, an expensive railway through this country which is stated to be sterile and not capable of maintaining a large population. One or the other must be wrong; either the statement that it is incapable of maintaining a large population must be wrong, or else it is extremely wrong and criminal indeed to build a railway which has nothing more before it than that. I have already, on one or two occasions, spoken on this subject and I do not wish to go into it again. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated, in his speech just now, that the boundaries of Quebec were not enlarged, that they were simply adjusted. I call his attention to the fact that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), in his speech last session, allowed that when the Confederation Act was passed the boundaries of Quebec were understood to be those

Mr. FIELDING,

that the maps of the period and the departmental publications of this government such as the census, gave. The census gave the area and the maps gave the delimitation of the boundaries of Quebec at that time. I do not think the Minister of Finance or anyone else is justified in making the statement that the province of Quebec was not enlarged at the time the boundaries were changed in 1898. As a representative from the maritime provinces I certainly protest against any addition to the area of the province of Quebec unless satisfactory arrangements are made to qualify the effect on the provinces that are affected thereby and more particularly the maritime provinces. I do that as a duty and also because the Minister of Justice at the last session stated that the maritime provinces must have been quite satisfied with what went on when the subsequent changes were made in the British North America Act or they would have protested against them. New Brunswick protested at the time Saskatchewan and Alberta were brought in. No heed was paid to its protest and I take this opportunity of protesting again. Whether heed will be paid to our protest I do not know, but it is our duty to make it. I do not think it is right, equitable, or just that the maritime provinces should be robbed of their representation by changes in the charter to which they gave their consent and by changes which have been made without their consent and without their having been consulted.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I did not think that after all the discussion that has taken place in this House on the question of the representation of the maritime provinces the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would have ventured to propose a further extension of the boundaries of the province of Quebec without so much as suggesting that the wrong which was entailed upon the maritime provinces by the last extension should be first righted. It is not necessary for me, in view of what has been said by my hon. friend for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) and at any rate there is no time at this stage of the session to speak at length upon the subject. It is well understood by all hon. members of this House that Quebec is the pivotal province by which the representation of the maritime and all other provinces of Canada is fixed and that if the population of the province of Quebec is increased by the addition of any territory the representation of the maritime provinces is correspondingly reduced. I do not think that I can put the case very much more strongly than it was put in the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) when he was discussing in the New Brunswick legislature, in the session of 1905, the injustice