

purpose of approving or disapproving of the schedules. I would like to know from any man who would exercise the smallest common sense what he thinks of such a suggestion. The legislative assembly was short some six or seven members. It was expected that on the 1st of July this Bill would become law and that the assembly would cease to exist at that time. I ask any man of common sense if the taxpayers of the Northwest Territories would desire Mr. Haultain to have a general election which costs a large sum of money, to put the people to that inconvenience, for the purpose of determining whether in their opinion the schedules prepared by the Dominion government describing the limits of the constituencies in Alberta are fair or unfair. I know that if I were a large taxpayer in the Northwest Territories and if any man came to me and asked me to cast my vote for the purpose of determining a question of this kind, putting the Territories to a large expense, I would not vote either for that man or any party that sustained him in any such proposition as that. It is an absurd idea. If the government had exercised sufficient care and caution to get their own friends to declare that this division was a proper one and one that meets the views of their own party, if they did not want to give fair-play to this party, the government could have treated the Conservative party with perfect indifference so long as they satisfied their own friends. I am bound to say after all I have heard of this question in this House that it will be many a long year before Alberta will have this friction removed that has been created by this measure. If, after the first six months they had an election and if in Alberta the legislative assembly saw fit to divide up Athabaska and give that small population two seats we could find no fault with them, but I think they are the proper parties to determine a question of that kind and that fair representation should be given to all classes there now in order that this very friction we are complaining of will not occur in that particular section of the country.

I have heard a great deal about the Athabaska and Peace River districts. That is a subject which has been before this House on many occasions. There is a committee of the House of Commons known as the Agriculture Committee, and at no time in the experience of the Committee on Agriculture, at all events, for the last 17 years to my knowledge, has the committee been so disturbed as it was over the question which was raised in regard to the character of the Peace River district. This disturbance was brought about by this very report that has been referred to since this discussion began. A government officer, Mr. Macoun, reported to the Geological Survey in a report dated 1904 the results of the work done by him in the Peace River country in 1903, and there is nothing in the report to justify the extra-

vagant statements made by the hon. member for Strathcona and approved evidently by the right hon. leader of the government itself. There is nothing in that official document to show the statements made by the hon. member for Strathcona to be anything like true statements. The hon. Minister of the Interior admitted himself that there are portions of this country that he had never passed through, that he had no personal knowledge of, but yet he took the opportunity on that occasion to dispute the statements made in this document. So, I say that instead of taking coloured statements, because I believe they are coloured statements that have been made by the hon. member for Strathcona and by the Calgary and Edmonton newspapers, let us take the authority of some person who is not interested, as the hon. member for Strathcona is and as these newspapers are, and if we do that I think we will be able to prepare a fairer schedule than we have before us to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member for East Assiniboia to say that the people there were perfectly satisfied with the redistribution.

Mr. TURRIFF. What I said was that the defeated Liberal candidate for the district of Alberta was in the city last week and in conversation he mentioned to me that he considered the whole redistribution of the province of Alberta was eminently fair and satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be interesting to read what is said by a gentleman who has been travelling through that country on business since last summer, and who has no interest in this question one way or the other. He writes

I have been talking to hundreds of Liberals regarding the Autonomy Bills and I have not found half a dozen who are satisfied with them. The people in Alberta are dissatisfied with the dividing line of the two provinces, they also want control of their own public lands. Then last but not least there is a big kick about the way the constituencies have been carved up by Frank Oliver so as it will be a sure thing that Edmonton will be made the capital.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who wrote that?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. W. J. Whitley, who is now in the Territories and from whom I received this letter the day before yesterday. He has no interest but speaks in a casual way of what he sees from day to day. It is the third letter I have received from him unsolicited. He speaks of the feeling of the people in regard to the educational clauses, the fact that the provinces want their own lands, and other features of the measure. There is apparently widespread discontent in that country because scarcely a letter you get from a resident there does not speak of it. What my correspondent's politics are I do not know;