

nations, treaty obligations, whether written or implied, should be lived up to. We see in the demonstration of the world to-day, the result when treaties were endeavoured to be set aside, and high contracting parties are in a position to correct the error. I would say that under the circumstances, having the admission from all sources that there was an evident intention to have a written contract at that time to the effect that we should have a minimum of six members for all time to come, that the party on the one side, the Dominion of Canada should concede to Prince Edward Island what was intended. Let us see how this matter of representation has worked out. When we entered into Confederation we were only entitled to five members on a pro rata basis of population as compared with Quebec. But we were given six—that goes without saying. In 1882, after the decennial census, we were still only entitled to five, but the statesman who had planned Confederation, who had made the bargain, was still living, and Sir John Macdonald, at the head of his Government in 1882 did not attempt to take away our representation of six. It was not until 1891, when the statesmen who had made the Conservative Confederation contract had passed away, that the men then in control of affairs—Sir John Thompson being Premier of Canada,—hewed to the line, and applied the law to the province, and we were put back to five.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Did the population decrease between those times?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY—No, up to that time it had not decreased to any appreciable extent. We were only entitled to five on the basis of population, but Sir John Macdonald knew the bargain, and so did not attempt to put us back. It was not until Sir John Macdonald passed off the scene that our representation was reduced, and the Federation pact was, in its essence, violated. It has been stated, and we hear it around the corridor—"Why should Prince Edward Island, with a population of 93,000, any more than one of the ridings of the city of Montreal of that population, have six representatives, while the riding in the city of Montreal has only one?" That would seem on the face of it a fair question to ask, but the city of Montreal was never a unit; it never gave up its autonomy. It was only a part of a great province, and when a colony gives up its autonomy—its

Hon. Mr. MURPHY.

self-governing privileges—the smaller it is the more it gives up; therefore, in giving that up, it gets a quid pro quo, and that quid pro quo should certainly be conceded to it with generosity, and not with niggardliness. There is another thing I would like to call attention to, and that is that the difference in urban and rural representation is very great. For Canada the unit of rural representation is 18,000 to 20,000, as compared with 32,000 and 33,000, the average general representation. We in Prince Edward Island are practically a rural population, and we have really only one city with a population of about 12,000—you could put us down as rural. Take the population of 93,000, divided by 18, and this would give us five members on the basis of rural representation in Canada. I contend on this point alone we are entitled to a return of our lost members, because as a rural population we are entitled to representation along those lines. Another matter I would like to draw attention to is that representation by population is something that has been argued over and over again, and representation by population, as far as cities are concerned, as compared with the country districts, is not put in the same category. For instance, take the city of London, today, and put it on the same basis as the representation of Ireland, and we would have 150 members for that city alone. Hence, for the purpose of comparison, provinces and large cities should not be compared on the basis of a unit with Prince Edward Island at all. There is another reason, too, why we should get our representation back, and that is that there were two sides to this contract; the one was on the part of the Dominion Government to furnish continuous and efficient steam communication, which would keep us in communication with the other provinces of Canada and enable us to trade with them. That provision has never been implemented up to date, and for that reason we have lost population. It is patent to any hon. gentleman present that you might as well sever the main arteries in a man's leg and expect the feet to develop, as to cut off communication and expect commerce to flourish. Hence we lost population by the Government not fulfilling part of the obligation as written down in the bond between the province and itself. I contend it is not fair to turn around and penalize us on the other side of the bond because we have lost population as a result of the fault of the larger party to the