

Ontario, 3,787,655; Manitoba, 729,744; Saskatchewan, 895,992; Alberta, 796,169; British Columbia, 817,861; Quebec, 3,328,815.

Dividing Quebec's population of 3,328,815 by 65, according to the section, we get a unit of representations of 51,213, and that would give to Prince Edward Island, two members; Nova Scotia, eleven; New Brunswick, nine; Ontario, seventy-four; Manitoba, fourteen; Saskatchewan, seventeen; Alberta, sixteen; British Columbia, sixteen, and Quebec, of course, sixty-five.

There is the other amendment which was also quoted by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, the amendment made in 1915, providing that the number of members from a province shall not be less than the number of senators representing such province. If we apply that amendment to the figures I have already quoted, it changes the picture quite materially because then Prince Edward Island, instead of having two members, would have four; Nova Scotia, instead of eleven, would have twelve; New Brunswick, instead of nine, would have ten; Ontario, instead of seventy-four, would have eighty-two; Manitoba, with fourteen, would still have fourteen; Saskatchewan, with seventeen, would still have seventeen; Alberta, with sixteen, would have seventeen; British Columbia, with sixteen, would still have sixteen, and Quebec's number naturally would not change. That makes the picture altogether a different one, because if we repeat the operation we performed when we first started and were to divide the population by the number of representatives, we would get an entirely different quotient from the one we started with of 51,213. The quotients for the different provinces would vary, in round figures, anywhere from 24,000 to 53,000, and that 53,000 applies to the province of Saskatchewan, and 52,000 to the province of Manitoba. So that Manitoba, which gets a reduction of three members, and Saskatchewan, which gets a reduction of four members, still have the highest unit of representation of all the provinces.

According to that picture, if we were to take, for instance, the Prince Edward Island ratio of representation, Manitoba would be entitled to twenty-five members, Quebec would be entitled to 139 members and Ontario to 158 members. That is one extreme.

Suppose we take the ratio of the province of Ontario, that would give Manitoba sixteen members instead of fourteen, and would give Quebec seventy-two members instead of sixty-five.

I am in full agreement with the hon. member who has just spoken. The province of Quebec at the present time under the consti-

[Mr. Jutras.]

tution is left with sixty-five members, with a population of 3,329,000, as against 3,778,000 in Ontario, and yet has seventeen fewer members than Ontario. That to my mind does not really give a fair representation.

It is quite apparent that the fathers of confederation when they put these sections in the British North America Act had the full intention of providing representation by population, and I contend that the constitution at the present time does not carry out that intention of the fathers of confederation. If we are to proceed with redistribution at the present time, fair play should be given to all the provinces, and if we embarked upon redistribution obviously we would have quite a problem to face. I still contend that this of all times is not the time to deal with redistribution at this session, because it certainly does not affect the present representation in this house. That cannot be changed until after the next election; and so far as the western provinces are concerned, we are having a census next year, which may throw a good deal of light on the subject. I would therefore strongly urge that the enactment of this legislation, if it be done at all, be delayed until such time as we can do full justice in this house to all the provinces in the light of all the circumstances.

One of the main arguments which were brought forward at the time that the amendment was presented to the British parliament for ratification was that a time of war was not the proper time to do such a thing. That was really a good argument and a serious one. It was felt also that the matter was too contentious to be dealt with in war time. I fully agree. I still ask myself the question, why enter into such a discussion at the present time? I for one fail to see why the western provinces should be penalized for having allowed their young men and their young women to go and work in the war plants of eastern Canada and the west coast. Some allowance should be made for these circumstances. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the question is one that is full of implications and likely to give rise to sharp and acrimonious differences, and I most sincerely suggest that neither is this an opportune time to consider the motion, nor have we time at present to do it full justice. For these reasons I submit that we should delay the matter until some later occasion.

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): I had not intended to speak at this moment. I had been informed that several others wished to take part in the debate. But