

two sides. It seems to me that my right hon. friend cannot be very earnest in his expression of regret that a course has not been adopted which he himself could have carried out, but which he did not take the proper steps to carry out. It is idle to endeavour to throw any onus upon this side of the House when we have not even had the opportunity of considering the acceptance or rejection of any such suggestion. In Great Britain in 1884, a deadlock arose between the two Houses over the Franchise and Representation Bills. To remove this difficulty Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury came to an arrangement whereby the question of redistribution should be submitted to commissioners, the principle upon which the commissioners should act, the instructions to the commissioners having first been arranged by a conference between the two sides. Five commissioners were appointed on the 29th of November 1884, and on the 5th of December they began their preliminary work. Shortly afterwards the judges called in officers of the Royal Artillery, and Royal Engineers, professional men familiar with the work of delimitation, with boundaries, and also called in a leading lawyer as assistant commissioners. After the preliminary divisions had been mapped out, notice was given of an inquiry in each division with a view to obtaining a better division if possible. As a result of that inquiry much additional valuable information was obtained, and the commissioners were able to make many improvements in the preliminary boundaries. This took place even in a country so thickly populated and so well known as Great Britain, in England, Scotland and Ireland, and the right hon. gentleman stood by that principle in 1899. Whether or not the measure which he introduced then was a measure for a complete redistribution, or whether, as he says, it was a measure to correct wrongs in the redistribution previously made, is immaterial; the right hon. gentleman then stood upon the principle and I quote his language:

The principle which we want to lay down and which we act upon is this, that whenever a county has to be divided into ridings, whenever a county which up to that time is entitled to only one member, becomes entitled to two or three members, the division should take place by judicial decision and authority.

That is the principle upon which the right hon. gentleman stood then, and I repeat once more, it is not only a principle which is absolutely applicable to the delimitation of ridings in these new provinces, but it is one which is tenfold more necessary in those new provinces than it was in Ontario when the right hon. gentleman laid down that principle. That is obvious, I think, to any hon. gentleman who gives the matter the slightest consideration or attention, and the only excuse for not adopting that course today as in 1899 is that we on this side of the

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

House did not accept an offer which was never made. That is the only excuse up to the present. Further, he has not given the slightest answer to the question I asked him a few moments ago. I asked him how it was that the voting strength in these different ridings varied so remarkably, and the only answer he has made to me is that Stony Plain is a rural constituency and Calgary a city constituency. In the first place the principle of giving less representation to a city constituency has never been applied to cities of the size of Edmonton and Calgary; certainly no such principle as that was acted upon in the redistribution of Ontario in 1903, and I challenge my right hon. friend to point to one instance in Ontario where any such principle was acted upon. It was applied to Toronto and Montreal, I do not remember that it was applied to any other cities although it may possibly have been taken into consideration with regard to Hamilton or Ottawa, but certainly in no cities of less size and importance than those to which I have just referred. Therefore it seems to me we can put aside at once any suggestion of that kind. We then acted upon the basis of population; we are acting upon the basis of population to-day according to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have 584 who voted in Stony Plain, and 2,052 in Calgary. But we shall leave that aside. We have 608 in Red Deer and 1,168 in Medicine Hat. Are there any natural divisions? Are there any local conditions? Are there any municipal divisions which make it necessary that there should be such a discrepancy? Taking the electoral lists we find for Stony Plains, 748 and for Calgary, 2,682. Omit Calgary if you please, and we have Stony Plains with 748 and Pincher Creek with 1,678. The right hon. gentleman, when we draw this discrepancy to his attention, suggests that we desire to deprive Stony Plains of representation. We desire nothing of the kind. We desire to have some principle whereby the electors of Stony Plain will have just the same voice and representation in parliament as those in Pincher Creek and I do not know that there is any reason why they should have more. There is a reasonable allowance to be made. That allowance has been fixed at 10 per cent in the case of the Transvaal. I do not know any reason why you should depart from that principle. I do not know why you should have Stony Plain with 748 and Pincher Creek with 1,678, an allowance of more than 100 per cent instead of 10 per cent as in the Transvaal. The right hon. gentleman has no answer to this except the suggestion that a rural voter should have more voice than a city voter. The constituency of Pincher Creek is not a city constituency, yet 1,678 electors in that proposed riding have no more voice than 748 in the constituency of Stony Plain. Does not the right hon. gentleman think there is some further answer