

Albert and part of the riding of Victoria. There is also a very small part of the riding of Battleford out of the east which also extends north. Now south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there were eight ridings: Medicine Hat, Cardston, Lethbridge, Macleod, High River, Banff, East Calgary and West Calgary. Grouped together you would not have three whole ridings north of the city of Edmonton, as divided by the Legislative Assembly in May 1902, while this distribution gives eight ridings north of Edmonton. As I pointed out before, there were eight ridings south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereas, now there are in all nine. They proceeded upon the assumption that conditions have so changed in that country that it is necessary to add five ridings north of Edmonton and only one riding south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The eight ridings north of Edmonton now are Athabaska, Peace River, St. Albert, Sturgeon, Saskatchewan, Edmonton, Stony Plain and Vermilion. Take another example. Township 38, which the Minister of the Interior submits as a fair line to divide that country in two—under that distribution which has never been complained of, there were, he says, six ridings north and the nine ridings south of township 38, and it is proposed by this schedule to give only eleven and a fraction south of that township, and thirteen and a fraction north. That is there have been added to the northern country seven and a fraction and to the southern country only two and a fraction. That is taking the line of township 38 and working out this scheme about 60 miles further north. It does not matter which line you take, it works out the same way, showing there must have been the grossest discrimination against the southern country or else the southern country has stood practically still since the 1st May, 1902. Now the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) says he was not in the Legislative Assembly when that division was made. Perhaps we will be able to give another example of a division which was made when hon. members now in this House for that country had seats here. Let us look at the country as it is divided up for federal purposes. Let us look at the constituencies in this House. They are four in number: Edmonton, Strathcona, Calgary and Alberta. That division was made in this House, only a couple of years ago. When it was made the hon. gentlemen from the Territories at that time were all of the one shade of politics. They were all supporters of the right hon. the First Minister. Surely they would not have made a division which would have been unfair to any part of the country or have discriminated against the interests of the Liberal party. That division was made within the last two years, and I find that south of that same township 38 we have the constitu-

ency of Alberta—the whole of it—the whole of the constituency of Calgary, parts of the constituency of Strathcona and part of the constituency of West Assiniboia. That is those two whole constituencies and a considerable portion of two more only get eleven seats under this proposed redistribution, while the constituency of Edmonton and the balance of Strathcona, north of the township 38, get thirteen and a fraction. When that division was made, it is to be presumed that the hon. gentlemen then representing the Territories, and who have a seat in this House now, divided the country so that every class and interests would have equal representation. That is there is given to one and a part constituency in this House thirteen in the local house, with the addition of Athabaska and Peace River, and two entire federal ridings and a portion of two others are allowed only eleven. There is another evidence of gross discrimination against the southern country. They have turned the scheme of the Legislative Assembly of 1902 up side down and have done the same with the division made by this parliament two years ago. All that need be done to see that is to look at the map. Take another example. In the constituency of Strathcona there were 5,871 votes cast last November, and to this constituency is given seven and a fraction, or practically eight seats. In the constituency of Calgary, where 5,633 votes were cast, they only get five seats. Is that representation according to the vote? The only justification possible for that division would be to show that the influx of population has been greatly to the north. I submit they cannot show that because every evidence shows that the influx of population has been to the south and the greater development has been south of township 38. There will be in the local house 25 seats. Out of 23 of these votes were cast last November, and we have a correct tally of those 23, leaving out Athabaska and Peace River where no votes were cast. If we take the first 11 seats south from the International boundary and the 11, leaving out the constituency of Red Deer which is in the middle, and taking the 11 next north, it will be found that in the 11 south there voted 10,833 and in the 11 north there only voted 9,356, making a difference of 1,477 discrimination against the south.

If we take the voters on the list, we find that in the 11 southern ridings there are 15,567, while in the 11 northern ridings, leaving out Red Deer, Athabaska and Peace river, there are 13,345, or a difference of 2,222 in the votes on the list. Now, I have worked out every constituency; I have taken the vote polled and the vote on the list, by polling sub-divisions; and if hon. gentlemen think that in any case the figures are not correct, all they have to do is to ask for those of a particular riding or challenge them, and either admit that we are