

number of post offices, the number of school districts, or the census of 1901.

The Canadian Pacific Railway tonnage for the years 1903-4 added together, including goods forwarded and received at the different stations on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the proposed districts are as follows:

In the south—	Per cent.
Medicine Hat section.. . . .	6.5
Calgary section.. . . .	1.9
Calgary.. . . .	21.4
Calgary to Laggan.. . . .	5.5
Bellington to Red Deer.. . . .	7.0
In the north—	
Blackfalds to Ellersley.. . . .	7.0
Strathcona.. . . .	7.5
In the south—	
Calgary to Macleod.. . . .	5.5
Lethbridge section.. . . .	2.6
Lethbridge.. . . .	26.2
Cranbrook section.. . . .	8.4

Thus the north contributed 15 per cent and the south 85 per cent. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I wish to say that about one-half of the length of the Medicine Hat section, from Swift Current to Walsh, will not be in the future province of Alberta, but all the other lines for which the figures are given will be entirely within its boundaries. I claim that the fact that 85 per cent of the tonnage of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the future province of Alberta is south of this mysterious township 38 is some indication, at all events, that there are more people in the south than in the north which provides only 15 per cent.

The present division of constituencies for the Northwest Territories in the future province of Alberta, is, as has been stated many times, nine in the south and six in the north. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has rather found fault with my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) because he said yesterday that if it were divided in the same way, there would be 15 in the south and 10 in the north. I do not propose to argue that there should be 15 in the south and 10 in the north. At the same time, I believe that the people in that country knew something of what they were doing when they made this division of 9 in the south and 6 in the north. I have heard no serious complaint about it, and, as I understand it, the government of the Northwest is not a party government, and never has been, but is made up of both sides of politics. I therefore feel that the present division of 9 to the south and 6 to the north must have had some merit—there must have been some reason for it. While I do not argue for it, because I have seen the figures, yet there must have been some reason for it, and I do not think the Minister of the Interior should have found fault with my hon. friend from Calgary for referring to it. The minister fights

Mr. PERLEY.

his own battles pretty hard, and I think the hon. member for Calgary should use every effort to maintain his own case. But I believe a division of 15 to the south and 10 to the north would be far nearer right than would the suggestion brought down by the government and so heartily approved by the Minister of the Interior. It would be nearer fair play to give the people of the south 15 seats out of 25 than to give them 12 out of 25, and I hope to give some figures presently to prove it. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has been working on this matter for a long time to my knowledge and has got out many facts and figures about it. I think he deserves the thanks of both sides for the labour he has undertaken. I do not know how long the government have had these figures, but I think they might have brought them down and saved members of the opposition much personal work, for we are entitled to have the figures from the government. There are two parties in this country, notwithstanding that the government seen inclined to keep information to themselves to the last moment as though they were the only party.

What does the Minister of the Interior reply to the facts and arguments of my hon. friend from Calgary? He begins by talking about partisans. He accuses the hon. member for Calgary of being a partisan merely because he has taken a lot of care—which as far as I know, nobody can find fault with—and tried to show his side of the case. It seems to me that if the minister had any real answer to these figures, he would not have spoken about partisans. This is a question that ought not to be argued on such a basis. My hon. friend from Calgary offered an amendment, that this matter should be left to the judges. I submit that, while the question of referring to the judges is one for parliament to decide, it is clear that the arrangement of the constituencies is a matter that could be readily determined by the board of judges proposed by my hon. friend from Calgary. The Minister of the Interior yesterday made a most extraordinary remark with regard to this proposition. He said:

The contention that an injustice has been done I submit has not been made out before the House. I submit it cannot be made out, and as I said in the beginning it would certainly be a very fortunate body of judges who would give a decision favourable to a proposal now before the House and escape criticism as active partisans by hon. gentlemen when their position had been ignored.

If the hon. minister is so satisfied with this case, why does he object to leaving it to the judges? Hon. members on this side have stated that if it were left to the judges we would be satisfied. I do not think it was a wise criticism on the part of the Minister of the Interior to say that there was no possibility of our being satisfied with any decision arrived at by the committee of judges.

In trying to arrive at a conclusion in my