

culty keeping people on the farms in western Canada, western legislatures passed debt adjustment acts, which meant that if a farmer was doing his best to meet his obligations a creditor was not permitted to eject him from his farm. Apparently that legislation has been ruled ultra vires of the provincial legislatures, which means that with regard to any debt incurred after May 1, 1935, a creditor will be able to eject a man from his farm even though he is doing his best to produce in support of the war effort. It means also that men who went before the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act boards and had their debts adjusted to some extent, cannot meet the terms set out in the orders of those boards, also can be ejected from their farms. It means that, owing to the policy of the Saskatchewan national war services board of ignoring the government policy laid down by the order in council of March, 1942, and of sometimes taking the last boy from the farm, even though he may be the only boy left to a widowed mother, farmers in some instances of sixty-five to seventy years of age have lost the only boy working on the farm. With prices of what they have to sell frozen at low levels and the protection in connection with their land taken from them by the decision of the privy council, we have put some of these men in the position where their farms may be taken from them while their boys are fighting for this country. I have no doubt that the government will do something to protect those worthy people. I am sure the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) will do something in that regard. But I suggest that he consult the provincial attorneys-general who know the problem and how serious it is, and follow their advice rather than advice he may

get from some people here in eastern Canada and particularly Ontario who seem to have an idea that the farmer is not doing his best to meet his obligations. I have lived among farming people all my life, and it seems to me that they of all people are the ones who worry most about their obligations and are most anxious to meet them. Therefore I urge him to see to it that these worthy people who are doing great things in relation to the war effort are protected as far as the possession of their farms and homes is concerned.

One other matter I wish to speak about before six o'clock is the representation of Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the House of Commons. If we followed strictly the policy of representation by population, we might be accused of being on unsound ground in asking the government to postpone the redistribution until after the war. We however do not do so. I have under my hand a table which shows that on one ground and another, apart from Quebec, no provinces after the next redistribution will be represented on the basis of population except Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. All the other provinces are not and will not be represented on the basis of population, owing to riders that were interjected for one reason or another, whereby they were given special protection. We ask that this measure be postponed until after the war because we have lost so many of our population on account of war conditions. In doing so, we are not asking for nearly as much as other provinces have asked for and obtained in the past from a fair-minded Canadian people. This is the table to which I have referred:

Representation in House of Commons

	Number of mem- bers province will have after next redistribution	Number of mem- bers province would have if representation based strictly on population	Excess over population basis
Prince Edward Island.....	4	2	2
Nova Scotia.....	12	11	1
New Brunswick.....	10	9	1
Quebec	65	65	..
Ontario	82	74	8
Manitoba	14	14	..
Saskatchewan	17	17	..
Alberta	17	16	1
British Columbia.....	16	16	..
Yukon	1	1	..
	<u>238</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>13</u>

On motion of Mr. Tucker the debate was adjourned.

[Mr. Tucker.]

On motion of Mr. Mulock the house adjourned at 6 p.m.