

acquainted with agriculture in this country or in any other who would suggest that farming operations are always a success; certainly no person who is acquainted with the conditions in any part of the Northwest Territories, not excepting the Indian Head district, to say nothing of the Calgary or Alberta districts. But this is not the argument which the hon. member is putting before the House. It has the evidence of unfair intent; an intent to prejudice the mind of the House and the country against a fair and square case. The gentlemen who put forward the contention that the representation of Alberta as it was in the local assembly was a proper representation, have established their position fairly well before the House. When eight constituencies only cast the vote of six constituencies, that is sufficient evidence as to the fairness of the distribution that was made on that occasion. I see that my friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) is becoming uneasy to get into this game.

Mr. HERRON. You are very much mistaken; I am trying to keep out of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I expect that in thunderous tones he will soon follow the argument of his friend from Calgary, and also declaim against the unfairness of this distribution, and possibly take his stand upon the fairness of the local distribution of 1902. I find, on looking at the distribution of 1902—that distribution which by the way was arrived at without a commission of judges, and of course was entirely without any partisan bias—that distribution gives the Macleod district which cast a vote of 1,700 or 1,800 at the last election, one representative, while it gives two representatives to the adjoining districts of Cardston and Lethbridge which together did not give as large a vote. Now, we may not have made a division absolutely to the line of a hair's breadth, but we certainly have made a distribution which shines by comparison with that made by our friends of the local assembly in 1902, if the case of the district of Macleod is to be considered. The district of Macleod has had to wait for this distribution in order to get justice.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Were these votes you mention, cast before the distribution of 1902.

Mr. OLIVER. No; last fall.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do you know what was the vote before the distribution of 1902?

Mr. OLIVER. There was no vote cast at the election of 1902; it was by acclamation I believe.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How could they tell then?

Mr. OLIVER. They had the census to go upon.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. HERRON. There was an election held in 1902 in the Macleod district.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I think the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. HERRON. I am not.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I think Mr. Haultain was elected by acclamation.

Mr. HERRON. He was not. He ran against a man named Harris and that man lost his deposit.

Mr. HENDERSON. It was pretty near an acclamation.

Mr. OLIVER. The census was taken in 1901, and the distribution of 1902 was made immediately after the census. If I have been able to get the figures correctly, I find that if we take the census as a basis, the whole of the new province of Alberta south of the north line of township 8 has a population of 33,040, as against a population of 36,398 north of township 38. If we had taken the census in making this distribution, I submit we would have been justified, but we did not take the census because it was not the latest available information. We took the latest figures available and we arrived at the result now before the House. I submit that the contention as to an undue preponderance of representation to the north country which according to the census has a population of 36,398 as against a population of 33,040 in the south country, does not carry with it the imputation of unfairness. Taking the census, taking all the facts, taking the comparative areas, taking the railroad construction now in progress and the further railroad construction in prospect, there has been an eminently fair and an entirely satisfactory distribution of seats in the province of Alberta. It is too bad that the same percentage of undue advantage that was held by the southern country under the distribution of the local assembly, has not been continued. My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has stated frankly to the House that he thinks it should be, and the statement of his views in that regard is sufficient to convince the House as to the fairness with which he approaches this subject.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do my figures correspond with the local distribution?

Mr. OLIVER. I presume they do.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where is the unfairness?

Mr. OLIVER. The unfairness is that eight districts in the south have only as many votes as six districts in the north. We have taken the votes as cast either in the south or in the north as the first basis of calculation, then we have considered the area and we have considered the railroad prospects, and we have given them repre-