

has no provision under any statutes that I am aware of for increased representation.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—I think my hon. friend the leader of the government is perfectly right in that matter, but considering the stand that the Premier of British Columbia has taken in pushing the interests of his province, and the fact that the Premier and the Attorney General of British Columbia were down here some time ago, when this speech must have been under consideration, it is a surprise to me to find that those gentlemen, who are so closely in touch with the present government, were not made aware of what was proposed to be done and that some one did not suggest that British Columbia should be given more representation in the Senate.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It would not be within the power of this parliament to do it. It would require Imperial legislation. The province of British Columbia has its representation under the Act of Union, which is an Imperial Act, and it would necessitate an amendment to that Act to give additional representation to the province.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—My hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong, but I do not think there would be any objection to suggesting in the speech from the Throne that representations would be made that an increase should be given to British Columbia so as to bring the representation of British Columbia in the Senate up to the level of the other three provinces. If it is based on the increase of population, the increase in British Columbia has been such that the province should have the same consideration as the other provinces. In 1901 the population of British Columbia was 178,657; of Alberta, 65,876, and of Saskatchewan, 25,679. In 1911 the population of British Columbia is given as 392,480, of Alberta, 374,663, and of Saskatchewan 492,432. The population of British Columbia, therefore, to-day is rather greater than that of Alberta, and inasmuch as the questions that arise in British Columbia are more varied than probably in these other provinces, if Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are

entitled to further representation in this Chamber I certainly think that some steps should be taken to give greater representation to British Columbia. At present, of course, as hon. gentlemen are aware, the representation from British Columbia in the other House is all on the side that my hon. friend the leader of this House represents. The government may have thought for that reason that it was not necessary to increase the representation in this Chamber, but I wish to draw my hon. friend's attention to this matter and possibly the government may see their way to give it consideration at a later date.

The other matters dealt with in the speech will come up for discussion later on in the session, and therefore I do not propose to take up the time of the House discussing them now. My stand in regard to the Highways Bill is very well known. I am very anxious to see the development of the highways of this country and if there is a constitutionally right way of bringing that development about there is also a wrong way. The proposition made by the government last session was the wrong way. No man who has been, as I have been for many years, connected with the country districts of the West and has seen the desirability of good roads to the farmers all through that country, could be opposed to any appropriation that would assist in giving the farmer better facilities for getting his crop to market, and helping in that way the development of the country; but there are certain ways in which these things should be done and others in which they should not be done, and if the government proposes to bring down a measure along the lines and in conformity with the constitution, I think it would be a most admirable thing to do. I do not think the public funds should be expended in a way to override the constitution of this country.

Hon. Mr. ROCHE moved that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at Three o'clock.