

or extent. That is very well; but, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), it is people that should count and men that should vote. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has asked why there has been no protest against inequalities in other provinces. If he were conversant with provincial affairs in Ontario, he would know that this has been a crying evil for many years, against which there have been numberless protests. At this moment the position is far from satisfactory, especially in the case of the city of Toronto. Toronto is represented in this House and in the local legislature by one member to about 45,000 or 50,000 of population, whereas rural constituencies each represented by a member some times have a population of 15,000. The Prime Minister rises to defend that by stating that the cities cannot be allowed the same representation as a country district. I do not think he made out a very good case; certainly not a case to justify the discrepancy of 400 or 500 per cent. The principle I contend for is that, if there is to be one man one vote, then it should be one vote one value. The Minister of the Interior has spoken of Toronto and Montreal as places whose representation as it is to-day should be protested against. So far as Toronto is concerned, a protest has been made; and Mr. Whitney, I believe, is pledged to remedy the evil in the near future, and that, I think, will be one of the first acts of his administration. Montreal is not quite in the same position as Toronto is. In Montreal a man may vote in every constituency in which he has property. It is possible for a man there to put in five votes. In Ontario a man may be a multi-millionaire, and own property in a dozen constituencies, but he votes only in one. There is inequality, and that inequality is being protested against, and will be protested against until justice is done. These are inequalities that exist. But here, under this Bill, you are establishing these inequalities in a new province. We ought at least to start equal—inequalities will come with time. Some districts will increase in population, while others will not increase, or may even decrease, so that, if changes are not made in the representation, we may find that one voter in a certain district has equal power with five voters in another. This is neither justice nor common sense. If the Minister of the Interior intends to uphold this distribution on grounds of reason, he should start with some principle—population, county boundaries, geographical position or geographical extent. But none of these is laid down, but each is followed as it may suit the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. The First Minister mentioned many considerations that should govern in these matters, but he did not mention the consideration of political complexion. It would be a comfort if we could feel that this was left uncon-

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

sidered as completely as it has been left unmentioned by the Prime Minister. But we cannot see on what other consideration these constituencies of very small population should appear on this map. We have heard of the fairness of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are glad to learn that they are fair. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) pointed out that there was a conference to which Mr. Haultain was summoned. Mr. Haultain is not here to say what happened. But the Minister of the Interior has told us that the question of the boundary between the provinces occupied nearly the whole time. But what we have to do with here is the boundaries between the ridings. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) tell us that the conference was held, and say that that was the time to protest. The members on this side say that they did not have this before them, and had no chance to protest.

Mr. SCOTT. When the conference was held the delimitation of the boundaries had not even then commenced. One of the purposes of calling the conference by Mr. Haultain, at the suggestion of the First Minister, was to discuss a method for the delimitation of the boundaries.

Mr. HERRON. At what date was that?

Mr. SCOTT. Some time during the week previous to the day the Bills were introduced.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman says there was a conference before these schedules were drawn out. Then that conference never reached the principal business it had in hand. Who finished the business? Who made out these schedules?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Haultain had his conference. I was agreeable to what was suggested and proposed a motion that we should have committees appointed from each of the proposed provinces to take up the matter of preparing the schedules. That motion was not agreed to. Not a single Conservative member in that conference seconded it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was there a solitary Conservative member at that meeting at that time?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Haultain was there and so was Senator Loughheed. Mr. Haultain called the conference together. He was premier of the Territories. His constituency was the whole Northwest Territories, according to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BARKER. He was not a member of this House.

Mr. HERRON. Cannot the hon. gentleman give us the date of that meeting?