

province by the quotient so obtained, disregarding, except as hereinafter in this section provided, the remainder, if any, after the said process of division.

I would be the last one in this house to oppose the carrying out of an act of justice toward each of the Canadian provinces. The latter are entitled to their respective representation in this parliament. This redistribution should have come long ago. If there is a province which has not been treated with fairness, as far as its representation is concerned, it is certainly the province of Quebec. Under this measure, Quebec would have eight more members. This should not be considered as a concession. It means the recognition of a right. Each province has the duty to assert the rights that have been guaranteed to her by the constitution. The dominion government, in turn, has the duty to respect the jurisdiction and the rights of the provinces. Since 1867, the constitution has often been infringed upon for the benefit of the central authority. To-day, we are asked to change a contract without the contracting parties having been consulted. It would have been easy to grant each of the Canadian provinces her full influence in the dominion parliament without any change in the constitution. My view in this respect is confirmed by the third paragraph in the preamble of the resolution which we are now considering.

It reads:

And whereas the said act provides for the readjustment of representation on the completion of each decennial census, and that on any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards;

I was right in saying, at the beginning of my remarks, that the government have shown consummate skill in drafting the present resolution. They manoeuvred in such a way as to quench the least opposition on the part of provinces losing members in parliament. They lessened the reduction in the representation of two provinces to a minimum and at the same time abated any opposition to their scheme. They could have achieved the same ends by sticking to the letter of the constitution. But Ontario would lose eight members and the other provinces a total of ten, while Quebec's representation would not change. The total number of federal members would fall from 245 to 227.

But the population of Canada has increased greatly since Confederation and I think it

would be unreasonable and unfair to work on this basis of representation. I am in favour of the bill, provided that provincial rights are protected. Their constitutional prerogatives must be fully respected. But I refuse to believe that we shall never see the day when the dominion government will give back to the provinces their respective rights, guaranteed by the British North America Act. The time has come when provincial jurisdiction over taxes, education, civil rights and legislation must be respected. The time has come also to restore parliament to its supremacy, encroached upon by all kinds of boards not answerable to the people. It is no use increasing the membership of this house if our mandate is taken over by a bureaucracy which has substituted itself to the representatives of the people.

The plan before parliament reminds us of a very humiliating condition. We have never ceased to be a colony. As a matter of fact, the London parliament will decide whether or not we shall amend our constitution. I submit that it is a shame, in view of Canada's heavy share of sacrifice and all the help we are still contributing to the United Kingdom. But who governs here? Is it London or is it Ottawa? What a shame for a country that has shed its best blood and shaken its economic structure for the sake of United Nations victory to apply to the British parliament because we lack the power to amend our own constitution! How disgraceful and humiliating for a nation!

But I know of some who will gloat at the thought of our begging on bended knees from the British house of commons the right to amend the British North America Act. They are the selfsame people who, for five weeks, opposed Canadian citizenship; who, in another place, opposed Canada Day, and who tomorrow will fight to the last ditch against the adoption of a Canadian flag.

Why does not the government put an end, once and for all, to this antiquated colonialism, so that Canada may never again suffer such humiliation? Why not ask the provinces, rather than the British house, their consent on the right and opportunity to amend the constitution? Paltry interests and ulterior motives rear their heads in this matter of national concern. Infringements of the constitution have become innumerable. And those infringements have been committed without the consent of the provinces. Breaches of contract invariably stem from an essentially evil prin-