

purposes one white man from Athabaska has as much to say as twenty white men in Calgary. To meet this argument the man of the north will speak of the coming of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and will dilate upon the glowing prospects of the future. But we are dealing with the present now. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not come before the second election in Alberta, and by that time there will be a second division of seats. Then the Athabaska country could get the representation that its population entitled it to, and in the meantime with one member, its interests would not suffer.

But much greater objection can be offered to the method adopted to arrive at the division. It means that the people of the south are not treated fairly, that being at a disadvantage they are punished for it, that the spirit of fair-play which has characterized the Liberal party which has in its hands the creation of these divisions, in this case is lacking. The people from the south have asked no favours in this struggle.

The article concludes by saying :

The result of the present policy will be deplorable. It means the lining up in battle array of north against the south. During the first few sessions of parliament, when the representatives should be intent upon the grave problems of legislation, they will be engaged in a local strife, and the effect of it will not be obliterated this generation.

That is from a paper supporting this administration, and to-day on the next page it will be found supporting the present educational policy of the government in so far as it affects the Northwest Territories. There are a number of papers which support the First Minister criticising this, from Lethbridge, Macleod, Medicine Hat and I venture to say that papers from every place in the southern and central part of that province irrespective of politics are criticising this decision. What was the method adopted in arriving at this division? From the Liberal press in that country it would appear and I am speaking subject to correction, that the work of dividing that country into 25 local constituencies was handed over to the hon. gentleman who represents Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. gentleman who represents Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) both from the northern part of that province. Fair as these gentlemen may be, they are tied down by local prejudices, they are the advocates of that upper part of the country, and yet we find them in the month of February admittedly cutting up that country into 25 local constituencies and, three months later bringing the schedule down to the House and stamping it with the judicial decision of the Minister of the Interior. I have sufficient information to know that the schedule which was prepared in the month of February by the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot), both from the north, is exactly the same schedule as has been annexed to clause 12 of this Bill with one or two alterations. The method, the idea is the same. The people of the south complain, and I think with some rea-

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

son, that they have had no opportunity of stating their case, of being heard, and if I am stating what is not correct, if the member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) did not prepare these schedules and submit them to the government, then of course they will correct me, I hope before I proceed any further.

Mr. FOSTER. You may proceed.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The situation is this that we have two men from one portion of the province with a local feeling existing which has existed for some time past, to whom has been handed over the duty of dividing that province up into 25 local constituencies, and the very best evidence of the unfairness with which they discharge their duty has been pointed out by the First Minister by saying that every constituency that has been left the same is south of township 24. I may be wrong, but if they can point out a constituency north of that line, that has not been altered then they have the opportunity of doing so now, but looking at the map the only constituencies they have left unaltered are the constituencies in the southern part of this province according to this distribution carved out by two members from the northern part of the province in the month of February. Why is this division unfair? I would ask the First Minister to look at the map. On May 1st, 1902, that country was divided up into local constituencies by the legislative assembly at Regina. As has been stated there were 15 constituencies in Alberta, and as the Minister of the Interior has stated, nine of these constituencies were south of township 38 and 6 north. There has never been any complaint as to the fairness of that division. The member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) sat in the local assembly at Regina, and I venture to state that he will not say he ever raised his voice objecting to that division at that time.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I was not there when the division was made or I would have objected to it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You have been there since, but you have not objected.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Why should I? It would not be of any use.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) sat in the House when the division was made, and I think he will bear me out when I say there has never been any objection made in reference to this division. Look at that division. In it you will find that there are only the portions of three ridings, or, to be correct, taking in Battleford and portions of four ridings going north of the city of Edmonton, a very small portion of the riding of Edmonton itself—the local riding which is shown in the blue line,—the riding of St.