

ing industry, and experience shows that it desires to be left severely alone. There is no class or interest that requires special representation in that country any more than there is in the outlying portions of the constituencies in Ontario and Quebec to-day.

Now, in regard to the proposed schedule there are some inaccuracies in the description, but I do not propose to detain the committee by dealing with them here. In describing constituencies that are bounded by rivers neither one side or the other of the river is mentioned. If there are islands in between there is going to be confusion created. In running along road allowances why not specify the centre of the road so as to avoid confusion? There are a number of other points of a similar character that I desire to bring to the attention of the committee, but they can be mentioned when each constituency comes to be considered specifically. But, one objection I do desire to point out now is that the boundary between the constituencies of Innisfail and Rosebud cuts the thriving town of Olds in two. Part of the town is in one constituency and part in the other. It is not necessary for me to take up the time of the committee in pointing out the many inconveniences that will result on account of it. The right hon. leader of the government has seen fit to doubt the figures that I have given in regard to where the population is in that country. No explanation has been given why the plan adopted by the legislative assembly giving 9 seats to the south of township 38 and 6 to the north has been practically turned upside down. Any person can observe that by simply looking at the map. That is beyond contradiction. The same equally applies to the representation which was given in this House three years ago when four constituencies were created out of the old district of Alberta. No criticism can be made of the argument, that, having regard to the contention which was made then, this proposed schedule discriminates against the southern country. The return showing the amount of money received for customs in the different parts of the country, bearing on the point as to where the business and population are, is a government return and cannot be contradicted. The same applies to the return as to the inland revenue receipts which was brought down. Does the right hon. leader of the government desire to contradict the figures as to railway construction when I say that only 150 miles have been built north of 38 and that 999 miles have been built south of 38, which is some indication as to where the permanent settlement is and will be. I can get the figures in detail if any person desires to criticise them. Am I right in the figures which I gave of the railway receipts showing where the bulk of the receipts is taken in from both passengers and tonnage of freight in the different parts of the country and showing that the proportion of in-

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

crease has been greater to the south than to the north? All these, I submit, have a bearing on the question as to where the population is and where the business is being done. None of these things are criticised, but as soon as I mention urban or rural population the right hon. First Minister finds fault with the figures. Figures have been handed to me showing that the population, less Indians, might be assumed to be 165,000. I do not pretend that the following figures are direct evidence of the location of settlement, but I do say that they corroborate the figures that I gave to the First Minister showing where the urban and rural population of that country was. If we assume that the population is 165,000, and work it out on the homestead entries for the last three years it would give a population of 75,500 north, and 89,000 south. Based on the customs receipts from 1894 to 1904, the population would be 52,000 north and 113,000 south. Based on the customs receipts given in the government return from 1903 to 1904 the population would be 54,000 north and 111,000 south. Based on the Inland Revenue receipts from 1903 to 1904 the population would be 40,000 north and 125,000 south. Based on the land, timber, and registration fees the population would be 53,000 north and 112,000 south. If you take the average on all these calculations the population would be 52,000 north and 113,000 south. If any gentlemen opposite wishes to work out the figures on the basis of the receipts from the different government offices he will find I think that I have been liberal in my estimation of the population in the north. The object of parliamentary representation as I take it is to give each class or interest in the community a voice in the government of the state. Looking up the precedents in this and other countries, I find that the aims of representation for electoral divisions are summarized in the instructions given to the commissioners in New South Wales a couple of years ago. These commissioners were instructed to divide up that country into local constituencies having regard to (1) the existing boundaries; (2) the community or diversity of interest; (3) the lines of communication; (4) the physical features; (5) the quota to be ascertained by dividing the number of seats into the number of names upon the list. In the Transvaal which is being divided now by commission, I find that a margin of 10 per cent is allowed. As to the schedule proposed by the government in this case, let me ask what evidence has the government or what evidence have the members of this House before them to enable them to decide as to that division in an intelligent manner having regard to the above consideration which should be given effect to? To-day for the first time we were told what was the total vote polled in these respective divisions. Are we expected to discuss that right away. To-day we are told