

berta, and you will find plenty of evidence, that they are very much worked up over the injustice that they consider is being done them. On the 8th May the schedule was brought to this House. Within two weeks there were protests from the Liberals and Conservatives in Calgary. There were protests from Raymond on the south to Red Deer on the north, a distance of 200 miles; from Medicine Hat to Pincher Creek, east and west, a distance of 150 miles. There were protests from 30,000 miles of territory occupied by 130,000 people. For the information of the House, let me read a few of those protests because I think they are pertinent to the discussion. The Calgary 'Herald' on May 11, says:

Every citizen, north and south, understands that the only excuse for this atrocious injustice is the determination of the allied interests to place the seat of government in the centre of the European half-breed population.

That shows that the feeling in Calgary was pretty strong over the matter. Here is what is said by the Calgary 'Daily Herald' on the 13th May:

In the history of Canada no greater political outrage has been perpetrated than that of which the above map tells the story. Nobody in the south wants to harm Edmonton or any other part of the north. All we seek is fair-play, and we have grave reason to protest against the grossly unfair way in which the federal government proposes to have a lot of small constituencies around Edmonton, and leave important, populous and prosperous communities in the south and centre with outrageously inadequate representation.

This editorial was reproduced and endorsed by the Red Deer 'News' of May 23, 1905. The 'Weekly Albertan' of May 11, 1905, published in Calgary, and a Liberal paper says:

The announcement that the Dominion government had completed the schedule of constituencies for the province of Alberta, and had decided upon thirteen seats north of Red Deer and twelve seats to the south is a bitter disappointment to the people of the south.

The division is unfair and cannot be defended. But the division, unjust as it is, is not as serious a matter as the method adopted by the government to arrive at the division. If the question of dividing the province had been left to an independent non-political body, or even to a parliamentary committee, composed of members of parliament who were personally uninterested in the division made, the people of the south would not have been aroused by the decision, even if we had only received eleven members south of the Red Deer line. We would have been disappointed, but would have felt that though beaten we had been beaten fairly, and that though at a disadvantage we did not have a grievance.

The present division is unfair, and the method adopted to decide upon the division is little short of iniquitous.

The population from the south have asked no favours in this struggle. They first requested a non-competitive point for the temporary capi-

tal. They were unable to get that. They were willing to concede that much to their Edmonton opponents, looking upon it as a tribute from the party to party supporters, granted because it was not considered that it would very materially affect the ultimate result of the capital fight.

But much greater objections 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.

Then the people of Calgary asked that the division of the constituencies be made by an impartial body. That was a wise, fair, just and unselfish request. Can any person point to a single defect in such a method of division? It is absolutely fair and just.

The result of the present policy will be deplorable. It means the lining up in battle array of north against the south.

That comes from one of the strongest Liberal papers in the province of Alberta. The next editorial in that paper is one in support of the government on other matters. The article I have just read was also reproduced and endorsed by the Macleod 'Gazette' on May 18, 1905, and by other papers throughout Alberta. The 'Albertan' of the 25th May, again says:

Whatever the administration at Ottawa may decide upon in connection with the division of Alberta constituencies, it will not be the fault of the local Liberals if some other method of dividing the constituencies is not adopted. The Calgary Liberals have been using every effort possible to induce the administration to have the original suggestion, that of leaving the task to an independent tribunal, adopted. The Liberals have prepared a full statement of the case, and have presented it to the administration in the most forceful manner.

Might I ask whether these representatives have been received and whether the Prime Minister will be good enough to lay this document on the table of the House?

The Raymond 'Chronicle,' far to the south, says:

This distribution of seats is felt to be unfair, as it had been tacitly agreed that the dividing would be left to an impartial commission, and taken out of the reach of a possible gerrymander.

Then follows in the same paper an editorial expression of satisfaction with the government on the educational question, thus showing it to be a paper sympathetic to the government. In the Lethbridge 'News' of Thursday, May 18th, I find the following expression of opinion:

The dividing of Alberta into electoral constituencies has been accomplished, and it amounts to nothing less than a gerrymander. The government's work in this case is certainly of a very coarse variety. It is a well-known fact that there is a keen rivalry between Calgary and Edmonton for capital honours, and that the issue largely depends upon whether or not a majority of the members of the first