

Now, the people of Alberta, (if we can judge at all from what we read in the newspapers from the west, and particularly from these proposed provinces), the people of Alberta had somewhat got the idea that they were going to have a commission which would delimit these constituencies, and it is not difficult to show by quotations from some of the papers that this is what the local desire calls for. Also we can readily prove, from the same sources, that the people of Alberta are grievously disappointed with the action of the government in this respect. I wish to submit a few of the figures which show why the people of Alberta are disappointed. I have not made my calculations in quite the same way as my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has made his, but they are made, I think, with equal care and effort, and I may say that they are the work of many weeks on the part of the members upon this side of the House. We have not relied on any officials. We have made our own calculations we have checked and rechecked, and I think our schedule will stand the test. We have made independent calculations, which I do not think can be in any way broken down. In the first place, I want to reiterate what I have already said, that we are not discounting the future. We are dealing with things as they are; consequently, the figures which we should look for are the figures as they exist. What is the extent and character of this country that we are called upon to deal with? Here we have a stretch of territory, 360 miles of which is settled, because there is practically no settlement, as there is no survey, beyond township 60. We have this district extending from the 4th meridian to the Rocky mountains, which is populated as far north as 360 miles from the border. This section of country was by parliament, 3 Edward VII., chapter 60, divided, in 1903, into four constituencies.

Obviously the division could not have been unfair for the Liberals because at that time that section of the country was represented by four Liberals in this House. The dividing line of these four constituencies was township 34, and Calgary and Alberta are south of township 34 and Strathcona and Edmonton north. The schedule that has been submitted by the Minister of Interior gives fourteen and a half members in the local house north of 34 and ten and a half members south of 34, while we claim that the natural division would be to give the same number north and south. I want first to submit estimates that are based upon population, and I am of course compelled to resort to figures which are furnished by local authorities and which if they be challenged by the government it is the duty of the government to show are incorrect. In the 'Northern Albertan,' a Liberal paper published in Calgary, on the 11th of May, 1905, there is

Mr. AMES.

an attempt to give the population of the constituencies according to the so called Oliver schedule. We find that the ten constituencies which lie south of township 34, viz.: Cardston, Pincher, Macleod, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, High River, Calgary (city), Gleichen, Banff and Rosebud, have a population of 120,000. In the 14 constituencies north of line 34: Red Deer, Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, Leduc, Strathcona, Vermilion, Saskatchewan, Sturgeon, St. Albert, Peace River, Athabaska, and Edmonton (city), there is a population of 100,300. If we take the new constituency of Innisfail out of the calculation because it lies north and south of township 34, we would have 120,000 south and 100,300 north, and Innisfail in the middle with 10,000, would give 230,300 in all which is what the 'Northern Albertan' calculates the present population to be. If we consider Innisfail as a neutral constituency then we have 52 per cent of the population south of it and 43½ per cent of the population north, and yet it is proposed to give 14 members to the north and 10 members to the south. If you take the total population of these constituencies as estimated by the 'Northern Albertan' at 230,300 you find that the average for each constituency is 9,212. I would like to know where the fairness comes in when 120,000 people in the south get 10 representatives and 100,000 in the north have 14 representatives?

There is another calculation of population which appears in the Medicine Hat 'Times' of the 23rd of May, 1905, which apparently has been prepared with great care because every figure is carried out to the end. Here again we have the 24 constituencies; here again we have Innisfail laid aside for the moment because it is on the boundary line, and the ten constituencies on the south are given a population of 89,834, while the 14 constituencies on the north are given a population of 75,590. It is proposed here to give 14 representatives to 75,590 people and 10 representatives to 89,834 people. Is that fair play? This calculation gives the total population including Innisfail at 172,853. I want to ask, as one searching for information, why should it require 9,000 people in the south to have a representative, when 5,400 people in the north are thought good enough to have a member. I do not know the country very well, but is there such a difference between the calibre of the people of the north and the people of the south that it takes 9,000 people in the south to have one representative while it only takes 5,400 people in the north to have a representative?

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer?

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Because such a large number of the 9,000 are imaginary people.

Mr. AMES. You will have to settle that with the Medicine Hat 'Times.' Let us