

make twenty-five new constituencies. In what way does the fact that there are now fifteen constituencies for the local legislature enter into the formation of the twenty-five constituencies which you have to create?

It evidently did not enter into it thus far that you adopted the fifteen that are there and did not change them. You did not let it enter into your considerations when you carved out ten others so as to make your number up to twenty-five. You went by the country that you had to divide and by the number of constituencies that you wanted, and you cut and carved, divided and added and subtracted to make up the distribution that you have now. How did existing circumstances find themselves as a factor, and in what way did they enter as a factor into this? Neither gave you the basis, because you have disturbed the basis. What did it give you? That I tried to find out from my right hon. friend from time to time, but I am quite certain I was unable to do so, and I may be uncharitable if I say I do not think he has been able to find it himself, except as a mere matter of declamation. What were the factors taken from existing circumstances that have entered into this? The Minister of the Interior gives the answer. He says that the only thing that has entered into it was the vote that was polled. He says what entered next was population, and he says that was a guide; what they wanted to get as near as possible was equality of population in the different representative districts. That is what my right hon. friend put forth as his strongest argument, and to-day he reiterated the same thing. He said: I do not care for north or south or the dividing line, I only want to see that the population is equally divided in these constituencies, and that consequently every elector has his proportionate share in the government of the province. Who raised the point of north and south? It was certainly not the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). The first mention I heard of that line of north and south in this House was by the Minister of the Interior himself. It was not mentioned as a division which should be sectional or anything of that kind, it was taken as a dividing line to show the population north and south and show if possible that the populations had been equally divided. But does it not strike the right hon. gentleman and his supporters and all the members of this House that when you have exhausted the argument as to twenty-three constituencies you have brought it down to this agreement amongst gentlemen on the other side of the House that as far as these twenty-three constituencies are concerned there is not any very great inequality shown. We have given fourteen to the north. You have given eleven north of Red Deer and eleven south, which makes twenty-two, and you have Red Deer in the centre. Consequently you have divided it

you say pretty equally. Even in that division the hon. gentlemen took care that they would get a political advantage. They get on that division more members than the south get. After that has been done, my right hon. friend comes in gratuitously and says: Over and above that we will just chalk off two other constituencies in Peace River and Athabaska River and we will add them to the north as well. Without these two it could not be shown that there was equality between the north and the south, but when you come to shave as near as hon. gentleman can to it, then they take away from the whole of their profession of fairness by injecting the vast districts to the north with a voting population of from 300 to 500 and making them equal to a voting population in each case of 960 in the south and in other parts, and they call that equality. They appeal to the principles of fairness and justice, they call on all Canada and high heaven to witness that they are doing exactly what is right. There is no insuperable difficulty with reference to the northern district. One thing I would like to know, is as to the distribution of population in the Peace River and Athabaska River. Are the people who are living there, the voters who will be, in settlements, and if so, in what settlements? There must be some knowledge with reference to this. I do not imagine that although the distance may be great you have a widely separated rural population up there. If you have a nomadic population that is one element that makes it very difficult to give them representation, but it may be that not so great an injustice would be perpetrated by not giving the nomadic part of the population representation as by giving them triple or quadruple representation. If you have a sedentary population residing in settlements what are those settlements? Your Interior Department ought to give us that information, and we want that information from them if it is possible. The Prime Minister says you cannot have a Canadian in this country and not have him exercising the rights of a free-born Canadian and a British subject. We have many people in this country who cannot exercise their rights. Circumstances alter cases, and the circumstances of distance and space and sparseness of population make it so that there are hundreds and thousands of people in this country who cannot practically be represented. This is due to the circumstances of the life which they have chosen for themselves, and the only duty upon a government is to follow that class of people as far as you reasonably can, and when they get into anything like a settled condition, into stated settlements, as far as possible to give them the rights of representation. To-day we have constituencies represented in this House within the limits of which constituencies there are living hundreds of British and Canadian citizens who cannot and do not exercise their franchise. Sup-