

estimated population for the present is quite sufficient; that is all that has been considered in the past or that ought to be considered now. The objections urged to the redistribution are not confined to the members on this side. I shall quote from an editorial in a Liberal newspaper. This paper says:

A present division is unfair, and the method adopted to decide upon the division is little short of iniquitous.

That is not the language of a member of parliament, but of a Liberal newspaper.

Besides this the population has been increasing more rapidly in the south than in the north since the present territorial divisions were created.

The vote in the south district at the last election was very much larger than the vote in the north country, yet the greater representation is to be made in the north.

These are extracts to show that the opposition is not coming from the Conservative party alone but from the friends supporting the government. Even the hon. the leader of the government has admitted to-day in his argument that taking into consideration the population of Athabaska it is not entitled to any more than one representative at the most. He has admitted that, why does he not then take in the same area in connection with the other portions of the province? It is only when he comes into that portion of country where there is sufficient population, that he falls back on his argument of representing area and we never heard before that area was represented. I do not see why there should be any departure made on this occasion. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) in order to bolster up the division that the member for Edmonton is said to have prepared for the government, has said that Edmonton is not the centre of the province, but that the centre would be 150 miles north of Edmonton. Does he not see what position he is placing his own province in? Where is Regina, north or south of Calgary? It is practically on a line with it.

Mr. SCOTT. Do not worry. Regina will take care of itself.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If Edmonton which is far north of Regina is not within 150 miles of the centre of the province how can Regina be in the centre, and how is it entitled to be the capital of the province? The hon. gentleman should not be so discriminating when taking that into consideration. He is quite willing to have Regina as the capital of the new province of Saskatchewan because it is his own city though it is about as far north and no farther than the city of Calgary. If there was a redistribution made by any Conservative government, if Mr. Whitney, in Ontario, or Mr. Roblin, in Manitoba, were to pass a redistribution Bill by which they should cut a town in two and put half in one dis-

trict and half in another would there not be a howl from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House? We had evidence of that in the past. The right hon. leader of the government laid down sound basic principles by which he and his government were to be guided in the redistribution of 1903 one of which was adherence to municipal boundaries. If a municipality were to be divided it would be a departure from that principle, and now this Bill proposes that we shall not merely divide rural municipalities but that we shall cut a line through the centre of a town. Is the community of interest there preserved? Still these hon. gentlemen say there is nothing unfair in this at all and that it is perfectly acceptable. No doubt it is satisfactory to their friends who live in the northern part of the province. How can it be accepted by this parliament as a fair distribution? Who made it?—two gentlemen, one the Minister of the Interior who resides in Edmonton, the prospective capital, and the other who resides adjacent to that prospective capital, the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot). The hon. member for Strathcona has not been here very long and we have not had an opportunity of gauging his fairness, but his conduct during the last day or two in the House in connection with these schedules would lead us to form the opinion that he is a very apt pupil of the Minister of the Interior. We know how much dependence to place upon the independence of the Minister of the Interior. It is true that he came into this parliament as a so-called independent. He mighty soon lost that as was evidenced by his occupying a seat by accident and temporarily in the government in order to do which he had to swallow his independent convictions. He has produced in this parliament a schedule that he wishes the members of the opposition to take as fair and just to his political opponent. Well, if the hon. gentleman were as sure of its fairness to the south as well as to the north as he pretends to be, what reason would he have for objecting to have it transferred for adjudication by a commission composed of impartial men? If they would do justice, whatever the decision they might come to I am sure that the people in the north and the south would heartily coincide in adopting their decision. I think we have the best evidence that in his own heart of hearts the hon. gentleman does not believe that he is doing justice to the south and that he desires to force this measure through parliament by the aid of a subservient majority.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the Prime Minister was to give us some information in regard to school attendance before we disposed of this amendment.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it seems from the explanations which have been given to the committee that this is simply a question of whether Calgary or Edmonton shall be the capital of this new