

own mind on this matter, I have taken this line of township 38 not because I know the country—for I do not, I am going entirely on the figures—but because other hon. gentlemen have taken it. As well as I can figure it out from the population—that is the votes cast and the voters' names on the lists—the south should receive 14 members and the north 11 members, instead of the south 12 and the north 13. If the south received 14 that would be 56 per cent of the whole and the percentage of the north would be 44. The hon. minister stated yesterday that the number of votes cast taken as the basis for each constituency would figure about 800. To clear up the discussion somewhat, I may say that, after looking into the details, I am quite satisfied that the figures as provided by the government and as submitted by the hon. member for Calgary are practically the same—in working out, the percentage of difference is so small as to be of no importance. In my calculations, I have adopted the figures of the government. It makes no difference in the number of members north and south which figures are used. Yesterday, the Minister of the Interior stated there would be 11,406 votes cast in the twelve proposed southern constituencies—I think that they should be 11,410, and that 'Hansard' is mistaken—and 9,553 in the eleven northern constituencies. The trouble with the figures, and the reason why there seems to be a difference in the argument on either side, is that the two proposed constituencies in Athabaska are left out of the calculation. The minister says there are 12 constituencies in the south with 11,410 votes and 11 in the north with 9,553 votes. As a matter of fact, there are 13 in the north with 9,553 votes cast in the last election. There are a few other people in Athabaska, but they are so few—as I shall show before I get through—as to make practically no difference. That makes a total of 20,963, out of which the north has only 45 per cent.

I submit that the proper way, however, is to take the number of votes on the list. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether, if he had been sick and unable to vote at the last general election, he thinks he should not have the right to vote at the next? Does he think that because, from any reason, he was unable to vote, his name should not be counted as a voter? I happened to see in one of to-night's newspapers that in North Oxford, at the general election last fall, there were cast 4,034 votes, and that at the election a few days ago the number who voted was 5,361. Would any man who was adjusting this question on a business basis claim that the votes cast last fall were the ones to be taken into account in determining the revision of that county? Would not the voters' lists in any part of the country be the only fair and proper way of determining

the population in the different constituencies, if you have no census to go on? I appeal to the right hon. the First Minister if the number of votes on the voter's lists is not a fairer test of the population of a county proportionately than the number of votes cast? If I am in a constituency with 5,000 votes on the list, and an hon. gentleman opposite is in a constituency with an equal number of votes on the list, and if at the last election there were 3,500 votes cast in his constituency and only 3,000 in mine, surely that would be no proof that there were less people in mine than in his. If I have 5,000 on my list and the hon. gentleman has the same number on his, in default of other information, it must be conceded that these constituencies are equal in population.

The number of votes on the lists, if taken instead of the number of votes cast, would tell against the hon. gentleman. I would not care to say that that is the reason why the hon. minister takes the votes cast, but I would like to hear some good reason why the number cast should be taken in preference to the number on the lists. The twelve constituencies south of township 38 last fall had on the voters' lists for the Dominion 17,087, according to the figures of the First Minister given yesterday. North of the said township the number was 12,863. This made a total of 29,950 altogether. The number cast north was 43 per cent of the whole and the number south 57 per cent, and my idea is that the number of seats north should be 44 per cent and the number south 56 per cent.

Before passing on to another branch of the subject, I wish to refer to a few figures given to-day by the right hon. the First Minister. In his calculation to-day he left out the constituency of Red Deer. He said there was north of Red Deer eleven constituencies with 9,533 votes cast at the last election, and that south of Red Deer there were eleven with 10,566 votes cast. The figures are quite accurate as far as I am informed. But he said, surely that is near enough for anybody, and the south ought to be satisfied with eleven seats. But, according to these figures, there are 1,033 more votes in the south than north, and, taking the vote cast in some constituencies last fall—in one there was 645 and another 589—you find that this 1,033 of discrepancy is equal to one and a-half constituencies. With regard to the numbers on the voters' lists, as given this afternoon, the discrepancy is even worse. Take these figures on whatever basis you like, it will be found that the votes cast were more in favour last fall of the north than the number on the voters' lists.

A reason has been given why there was not a larger vote cast in the south last fall. But I do not think it is necessary to give any reason. I do not think any judge would say it matters whether the votes were