

ber of the fur trading firm of Breden & Cornwall, I presume, who has every faith in the future of that country, but if I wanted to, which I do not, I could quote reports which do not bear out all the statements of Mr. Breden and which are known to hon. members of this House. He also speaks of Grand Prairie which has an area of 60 x 20 miles, not one quarter of the area of the Canadian Pacific Railway irrigation block in the neighbourhood of Calgary. Will there be a denser population in the next six months in the Grand Prairie region which is, I suppose, 200 or 250 miles from the end of railway construction or right along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in their irrigation block? So I say the statements made by Mr. Breden are statements showing that he is too wrapped up in the future of that country to bear disinterested testimony. If it is such a grain producing country why has it not been developed? I will not say anything detrimental to that country, but I will submit something which is in its favour. In 1876 grain which was grown at Fort Chippewyan at Athabaska Landing took first prize at the Philadelphia exhibition.

Mr. INGRAM. Grown in a garden.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I do not know where it was grown but there it was. You can go through that country and pick out certain spots like Fort Vermilion and Grand Prairie which may be more favourable to the cultivation of grain than other localities are. Letters can be produced showing that there are conflicting reports in regard to that country. I think it can be established from the paper owned and published by the hon. Minister of the Interior that more grain wheat and flour are brought into Edmonton then shipped out. The supply is not sufficient for the local demand. If this is such a grain growing country surely that would not be the case. I think that if the hon. gentleman will read his own paper, published about 1901 when the Canadian Northern was built across the river, he will find that a record was kept for some time which will bear out what I say. We have been told about the number of steamboats in that country, but we have asked for a return for some information in regard to these steamboats. No record is kept of them by the government. They have two flour mills and they have saw mills but all those things which we have heard about to-night constitute no reason why they should have double the representation according to population that is given to southern constituencies. Look at what has occurred in the south since the last local distribution was made. Take Cardston, for instance, at which a beet root sugar industry has been established capitalized at \$400,000 not a dollar of which stock can be bought to-day, take Pincher with its coal mines at Frank and at Carbon, take the Bankside Coal Mining Company where over \$1,000,000 was spent in coal mining last year

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

and take the coal mines at Canmore. Are Athabaska and Peace River, with their two mills and one-tenth the population entitled to have four times the representation that Pincher Creek or any of these other constituencies are going to have? I would not take up the time of the House making these statements if the statement had not been made on the other side which would indicate that all the development since that distribution was made in 1902 has been in the northern part of the country. I simply make these observations with the view of showing that population has been flowing very rapidly into the southern part of the country and with the view of showing that these statements of the hon. minister in regard to the condition of the industries of that country in 1902 do not apply to-day.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for Strathcona gave us some figures a little while ago which purported to show that the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition was unfair to the north, and amongst other things they quoted the votes cast at the last election. It seems to me that it is very unfair to bring up the number of votes cast in the southern part of Alberta when it is known perfectly well what the reason was last fall why there was a smaller percentage of votes cast in the southern part than there was in the north. That fact does not prove that the voters were not there. I propose to show, from the figures given by the right hon. leader of the government, that the division between the north and south proposed by the leader of the opposition is absolutely fair. Under his proposition there would be 12 constituencies south of township 34. Under his proposition this mysterious line, township 38, is changed to township 34 and each of the 12 constituencies south of township 34 would have, according to the figures given by the right hon. leader of the government, 10,153 votes cast at the last election. The northern part of township 34 comes almost in the middle of the proposed constituency of Innisfail, so that I have taken the figures for the constituencies south of the middle line of Innisfail, with half of Innisfail and that makes 10,153 votes cast at the last election. The leader of the opposition suggests that they should be given 12 seats, which would give an average of 846 for each. Under the amendment there will be 13 seats north of line 34 and at the last election these 13 seats cast 10,810 votes to which I have added 300 votes which would presumably have been cast in Athabaska had there been an election there, thus making a total of 11,110 votes cast north of township 34 which for the 13 seats would give an average of 855 votes for each. The leader of the opposition proposes to the government a plan by which there will be 12 seats south of township 34 in which 10,153 votes were cast at the last election or an aver-