

baska lying north of Alberta should be cut in two and two representatives be given it. By reason of the population? Not at all, but by reason of the immense amount of wealth, as he put it, that was invested in these enterprises in that portion of Athabaska. As a result he concluded, and no doubt Edmonton approved of his conclusion, to cut Athabaska in two and give it two representatives. That is what they did, that was the starting point. Then they said: We will divide the other portions of Alberta into twenty-three districts. That is what they did. Then the next move was this: Calgary polling the largest vote of any place in Alberta, they cut that vote out. Why? Because it was the largest vote polled in Alberta. Then they come up to Edmonton where there was not so large a vote, and they cut that out. In order to do what? To divide that portion of the territory north of Red Deer, township 38 into a certain number of constituencies, according to the number of votes polled less those in Edmonton. And the same rule applied to the south. And it was by these means that the hon. gentlemen put thirteen representatives in the north and twelve in the south. Now if there was no government seat to be chosen these arrangements would have no importance. But they knew there was to be a government seat chosen, and they wished to procure a representation that would decide where the government seat should be situated. And that is what these gentlemen had in view at the time they made this schedule, there is no question about it. Now if the First Minister wanted to be fair, what would he have said? He would have said that previously to the introduction of this Bill on the 21st of February these schedules must be prepared, as the schedules are prepared in connection with every other Bill when it is introduced. But in the preparation of these schedules what course must he pursue in order to do justice to all classes in Alberta? And what would my right hon. friend have said then to the member for Edmonton and the member for Strathcona? You consult with the defeated candidates for Calgary and Alberta, and you four gentlemen between you map out what the different constituencies ought to be in Alberta, and when you do that I will embody it in this Bill and submit it to parliament, and we will have a fair representation, at least one that will be satisfactory to our friends.

But, not so. The Dixie line which my right hon. friend mentioned has been created by his own conduct or that of his friends in the preparation of these schedules and the Dixie line or the Red Deer line will be heard of for many years to come by reason of the way in which these schedules were prepared. What follows from this legislation? We are preparing schedules here for the purposes of an election which will take place within six months of the passage of this Bill. It is our duty and it ought to be the

Mr. INGRAM.

duty of our hon. friends on the other side of the House to provide for a fair representation of the different parts of the province of Alberta as created by this Bill, so that when the representatives of the people meet in the legislature of the new province they can select any place they desire to be the seat of government for all time to come or so long as they feel disposed to continue it at the place decided upon. That would have been the proper course, but that course has not been followed on this occasion and that is what the people of Alberta are complaining of. Apart from my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) what interest has any member of the opposition in the question as to where the seat of government shall be? What interest is it to me whether Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Red Deer or any other place is selected as the government seat? It is of no interest to me but it is of some interest to me to know that the new province shall have no friction created by any legislation passed by this House. A good deal has been said about those newspapers from which quotations have been read. My hon. friend from Calgary quoted some statements made by the Liberal press of Calgary. I can understand that and I shall not be influenced by what the Liberal or the Conservative press says in the city of Calgary because I look upon them as prejudiced and biased witnesses as I do upon the Tory newspaper which is edited in Edmonton, and which has expressed its approval of the distribution which favours the establishment of the government's seat in Edmonton. These newspapers have no influence on me because they are prejudiced witnesses, but it is interesting to note what the press of Medicine Hat, Lethbridge and other places that have no idea of getting the government seat have to say. South of Red Deer the press complain of this division but north of Red Deer the press are satisfied. On the south side there are Liberals and Conservatives opposed to this division because they have not been treated with that spirit of fairness which the right hon. premier ought to have displayed towards them. Does the right hon. gentleman believe that we have no reason for complaint? I believe we have every reason to complain because this is not merely a question of the selection of the government seat. If we are giving these people representation it should be so carefully given to them that no man north or south of Red Deer should have any cause to find fault with the division. If instead of shutting out our Conservative friends entirely they had been given an opportunity of sitting down with the hon. gentlemen opposite we would have come to some conclusion which would have removed all this friction that is liable to continue for years to come. The hon. Minister of the Interior has found fault with Mr. Haultain. He says that Mr. Haultain should have called the assembly together for the