

As regards the other provinces, in the period 1941-44, 7,000 left Prince Edward Island, 8,000 had gone into Nova Scotia, 19,000 had left New Brunswick, 11,000 had left Quebec, 58,000 had come to Ontario, and 90,000 went to British Columbia. I found these figures very interesting as showing the migration of the population within Canada. They do not take into account at all the position of the armed services. This is just civilian migration within Canada and it indicates that there is a very important problem which will have to be faced by this house in regard to redistribution.

I urge the house not to take away any of the rights of representation granted the maritimes, but I suggest that if it is found proper to protect the powerful province of Ontario from losing her representation, so that, if we are to redistribute on the basis of the present law, she will have eight members more than she is entitled to—

Mr. MacNICOL: May I interrupt the hon. member to point out to him that the fathers of confederation, when they drew up the British North America Act, were not specifying for Ontario only. The hon. member can never miss taking a fling at Ontario.

Mr. TUCKER: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. I am not taking a fling at Ontario; I am pointing out the manner in which the British North America Act has worked out. I think that fair members from Ontario will go along with me when I say that if the constitution has worked out in such a manner that the powerful province of Ontario will be left with eight members more than the number to which it is entitled, if calculated on the basis applied to a province like Saskatchewan, then something should be done to safeguard the position of a province like Saskatchewan which will lose four seats.

Mr. MacNICOL: Ontario's representation has gone down from ninety-two to eighty-two, but we did not holler about that.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes; but if you insist that we have to go entirely on the basis of our population, then you should be willing to go on the same basis yourself.

Mr. MacNICOL: We did lose ten.

Mr. TUCKER: And you have this added advantage, that you have big cities in the province of Ontario, and in those cities you can set up seats that are very populous, giving the right to rural districts to have adequate representation. We have not that safety valve in Saskatchewan, and I think it is very important that this whole situation should be carefully considered.

Incidentally, it irks me to think that, in order to provide for the representation of our people in this parliament, we have to go to the parliament at Westminster to get that change. That, of course, is not the fault of the parliament at Westminster because it was at our own request that it was done; but my own feeling is that soon we shall have to provide some means whereby we can amend our own constitution, thus relieving the parliament at Westminster of what sometime may prove to be an embarrassing job. I think it would be better for them as well as for ourselves.

I simply rose to make that point and I wish to reemphasize, to my hon. friend the member for Davenport and other Ontario members, that when I cite the case of Ontario I am just citing what appears to have been an anomaly that has developed on the basis of a section in the British North America Act which has been interpreted by the privy council. I am sure that the fathers of confederation could not have intended that Ontario should have the right to retain eight—and perhaps, as the years go on, an even greater number than that—more seats than she is entitled to on the basis on which the number of representatives is fixed for other provinces. I suggest that if that right is to be retained to protect Ontario in the possession of these eight extra seats, then in all fairness some such provision as has been found to protect the maritime provinces should be written into the British North America Act in order to protect the prairie provinces in the possession of adequate representation in this house.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): It is perhaps easy for one to say that one agrees entirely with the contents of the resolution presented by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Dorion), but I cannot sympathize with the impatience shown in having redistribution, as indicated in the words of the motion that "immediate consideration" be given to the advisability of proceeding during the present session with representation of the provinces in the House of Commons.

I do not believe I have the power, but I think I have the right, to suggest a tentative session or date. Personally, I believe that the year 1947 would be appropriate for reasons which I shall mention later on.

I listened attentively to the mover of the resolution, and I was certainly impressed by his sincerity and his force as to what may happen as far as redistribution of the representation in this house is concerned. I do not know whether all members realize how difficult it is to belong to a racial group