

some consideration to that development, which is not merely in prospect but is assured, would certainly fall far short of meeting the fair and reasonable requirements of the country. I will not dispute with the hon. gentleman as to the figures which he read of the vote in each constituency. It matters very little whether it is a few more or a few less; the general result is about the same. The question at issue is not between several constituencies, but between northern Alberta and southern Alberta. Now, the vote cast at the Dominion election in the province of Alberta, not including the district of Athabaska, amounted to practically 21,000, giving 12 constituencies in the south, including Red Deer, although part of it is north of the line mentioned. That is, 11,406 votes in the 12 southern constituencies as against 9,553 votes in the 11 northern constituencies, a difference of 1,853 votes, exclusive of the district of Athabaska. Now, we say that the greater area of the northern part of the old district of Alberta, to which is added the area of the district of Athabaska, and the prospective increase of population resulting from the construction of 275 miles of railroad during the present year and the balance of 700 miles of railroad within the next four years, are certainly ample justification—

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman calculating for a distribution of seats four years hence?

Mr. OLIVER. No; I am calculating for a distribution of seats this year which will stand for four years. We believe that the allowance of 1,800 votes for the difference between 69,000 square miles in the south and 211,000 square miles in the north, with the increase of railway facilities, is certainly not taking any undue advantage. On the contrary, we consider that the country to the south is receiving everything that it can reasonably claim, or that is claimed by sound argument, from the statement my hon. friend has made here to-day.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is not overlooking the fact that he is providing for an election that must be held within six months, and not four years hence.

Mr. OLIVER. I am aware of that fact; but I am aware also that the representatives to be elected will in all probability be elected again four years hence, and that therefore we are entitled in all fairness to consider the conditions as they will exist four years hence, as when a distribution was made of seats in the Northwest Territories, allowance was made for a prospective increase of population. What was right then is right now. My hon. friend has found a great deal of fault with the representation of the district of Athabaska, it is going to cost money to represent it. Now this new province of Alberta lies immediate-

ly alongside the province of British Columbia. It is very little inferior to British Columbia in area, or, we believe, in value, and we believe that not the least valuable part of the district of Alberta is that part now called the western part of the district of Athabaska. The northern line of the new province of Alberta is identical with that of the province of British Columbia. But there is no part of British Columbia that is not represented in this House, and the isolated parties of miners in the northern part of British Columbia, far north of the Peace river on our side of the mountains, are secured in their right to representation both in the local house and in this parliament. There is a member representing that part of British Columbia lying immediately across the mountains from the Peace river, which is just as inaccessible, just as difficult to reach, and having very little less population if any than the proposed district of the Peace river. My hon. friend has the easiest way in the world of arriving at his conclusions; by the elimination of what he does not wish to see, and by exaggerating what he does wish to see, he can produce any result he wishes. So when he does not want to give that northern country the representation to which it is by area, and population, and possibilities and prospect entitled, he simply ignores it, and says it can either go without representation, or it can be represented by somebody who does not know any more about it than he shows he knows himself, if we are to judge from his arguments.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman contend that whilst the northern country is going ahead the southern country will stand still?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely not. My hon. friend has rather been led into that suggestion reversed, but I have not. We admit the progress and success of the southern country. It certainly has gone ahead marvelously, and is entitled to all consideration. But that is no reason why the progress of the northern country, the greater possibilities of the northern country, because of its greater area if for no other reason, should therefore be ignored. I was rather struck by the easy way in which my hon. friend disposed of a certain constituency to which he particularly objected, the proposed constituency of Stony Plain. He spoke at some length of the population of the constituency of Cardston. Now the constituency of Cardston I know probably as well as he does and Cardston only gave 640 odd votes at the last election, while the district of Stony Plain gave a little over 600 votes. But he proceeds at once to eliminate the constituency of Stony Plain by producing a map which he says shows there are no surveyed lands within that constituency. Now the Department of the Interior may have made an error, and may not have shown the surveys that have been made there, but I can assure him that