

he does not write from a party point of view, but he speaks of the general discontent among the people and he says that the Reformers are just as much dissatisfied as the Conservatives.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They did not show it in the Edmonton election.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member had better keep quite on that; that is too much comedy.

Mr. HERRON. Before the debate closes I wish to say a few words in connection with the proposed schedules. Although I had something to do in assisting the hon. member for Calgary in preparing the figures, I shall not follow him in his argument, because he, and the hon. members for Montreal and Argenteuil, have placed the results before the House in so convincing a way that it is not necessary for me to speak of them in detail. The figures presented by these gentlemen ought to be sufficient to show this parliament that an injustice is being done to the southern portion of Alberta. I do not believe that the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior have any solid foundation for their contention, that the geographical conditions of the north should be taken into consideration as against the greater population of the south. As the Minister of the Interior knows, from 1887 up to last November, almost the whole of the new province of Alberta was represented by one member in this parliament, and the hon. gentleman himself has represented it for the last eight years. If there is a good reason why we should have two members for that northern country to-day, there must be very good reason to say that we have been very badly represented for the last eighteen years. Alberta, which has been represented by one member was certainly far greater in area than the Peace River and Athabaska districts to which it is proposed to give two members in the local assembly. The district of Alberta was something like 450 miles in length and over 300 in width, while the new district is in or about 300 miles square. The industries were just as varied in the old district of Alberta as they can possibly be in the two northern constituencies. One hundred miles north of Edmonton in a district which the Minister of the Interior represents, is chiefly a fur-producing district, Edmonton is an agricultural district and the south was a stock-raising district for a great number of years. If the varied industries afford a good reason why this district should now have two members, it affords the same reason why we were badly represented for the last eighteen years all over Alberta. I was interested last evening to hear the member for Strathcona refer to the industries of Athabaska and Peace River districts. I shall not dispute his figures because I have no statistics to enable me to do so, but at

Mr. SPROULE.

the same time I do think they were very much exaggerated. I am quite satisfied, from the conditions in that country in the early days and judging by the conditions which prevail in mountain and foot-hill countries generally, that the stores to which he referred are in a great many cases not what people down here would consider ordinary places of business. A store in the general acceptance of the word in such a country simply means a settler living by the wayside who may be twenty-five miles from a neighbour and who only keeps articles for trading purposes with travellers who frequent that northern country. It would perhaps be more correct to call these stores trading post. I know also the Hudson bay have posts in that country. I think the hon. gentleman stated last evening that one of these stores represented something like \$300,000 of commerce. I suppose it does at certain times of the year, when the furs are coming in. But it is a trading post just the same, and I do not think it indicates much permanent settlement in that country. I do not think the stock interests are very great—in fact, I know they are not. I have not been there for a number of years, but I have information from men who travelled that country and that information is quite as reliable as that of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver.) It is a moving population. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has said that, according to the present regulations of the department, squatters' rights are not protected in unsurveyed territory. The surveyed territory, I believe, extends only about 50 miles from Edmonton. Therefore, the population outside of that limit is not of a permanent character.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member (Mr. Herron) will pardon me, but, while there is no regulation of the department protecting squatters' rights in this country, squatters' rights are and always have been held to be the best rights a man could have.

Mr. HERRON. That is not borne out by experience in my country. Previous to about 1889, squatters' rights were recognized, but about that time notices were scattered broadcast that they would not be longer protected. I know many cases of people having been removed, and denied redress because of the notice having been given that they were no longer protected.

Mr. OLIVER. Squatters before survey? I think not.

Mr. HERRON. Yes; they are not protected now as they were before 1889. Therefore, I say population in that country is not of a very permanent character. A fair estimate of the number of voters in that northern country would be 250 for each constituency. Compare that with some of the districts in the south. Take, for instance, Cardston, with its great irrigation scheme, in which probably more than \$1,000,000