district with 3,196 has but one representative. If we are to go upon the principle that you must have approximately the same number of people to the same number of representatives, it would be a very dangerous principle and a very difficult one to adhere to in new countries such as the Northwest Territories and British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the hon. gentleman think ; is it that we should pass a resolution of censure on the legislature of British Columbia ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I would not attempt in this parliament to censure the legislature of British Columbia ; they have been doing very well considering.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I desire to refer just for a moment to one or two statements of the Minister of the Interior ; and, first, with regard to his observation that the opposition were apparently coming down one seat a day. I submit that no such interpretation can be placed upon our action. At the outset we proved beyond contradiction—by simply calling attention to the map of the local seats as distributed by the Northwest legislature in 1902—that there were nine seats given to the southern portion and six seats given to the northern portion. We showed by simply pointing to the map that that distribution by the local legislature was a fair one, and we stated that it had been decreed by a non-partisan government after all localities in the country had been represented and had had an opportunity of stating their views. We showed that in that distribution there were at that time three local seats, or only a part of three seats, north of the northern limit of railway construction, and we show that under this proposed distribution to-day there are now eight seats north of the northern limit of railway construction. We showed that in the southern country, under the distribution of 1902, there were eight seats south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we show that to-day these eight have only been increased to nine. We have therefore proven very clearly indeed that if the local distribution of 1902 was fair, this proposed distribution is manifestly unfair. The suggestion has been made on the other side that the local distribution was unfair, and in answer we have pointed out that no complaint has ever been made in the local assembly against it ; and if there had been complaint, there is no doubt that gentlemen opposite would have been informed of it. In order to justify the division which the government now proposes, they must proceed upon the assumption that all the development has been in the northern part of the country, and that the southern part has been at a standstill, or has just sufficiently developed to entitle it to only one additional new seat. We have proven our assertion that there is undue representation given under this proposal to one section of the country, and that there has been discrimination against another part of the country. When gentlemen opposite contended that the local division of constituencies was unfair, we proceeded to show that their own division of constituencies for federal purposes in 1903 was also unfair. We showed from the vote polled and from the number of voters on the list that there was discrimination against a certain section of that country. We asked and we hoped that the government would accept our evidence as to the justness of the position we took, but the government have refused to do so. Then in order that there may be no dispute about the figures, the proposition which we now make in this amendment is so manifestly reasonable that I do not see how any person can oppose it. We tell the government that we will take their own distribution of 1903. Let me say that when that redistribution was made in this House all the members from that part of the country were supporters of the Liberal government. Notwithstanding that, we assume that when the division was made in 1903 this government gave fair and equal representation to the different sections of the country. We have the facts here to prove that there has been a greater influx of population into the southern portion than there has been into the northern portion for the last three years, but we do not insist upon that ; we simply adopt the decision of the government in 1903, and ask them to give these different sections of the country the same proportionate representation that was given then, and have it divided up by a commission of judges, giving five to Alberta, one to the portion of East Assiniboia which is taken into Alberta, and which has 1,650 names on the voters' list ; six to Calgary, six to Strathcona, six to Edmonton. Then we say there will be one left which you can place in Athabaska, and which is giving Athabaska very generous treatment. An attempt has been made to charge this side of the House with a desire to prevent a certain section of that country being represented at all. That is not a fact, and in order to demonstrate that it is not a fact, I may say that I had an alternative schedule prepared, and in that schedule I proposed that Athabaska should get one representative along with the northern section of Alberta. We do not desire that any portion of that country should not have representation, but we do desire that no section of the country shall have undue representation to the detriment of another section. That is our position. We are taking the division made by this government itself, and we merely suggest that these four ridings be divided up into local constituencies so as to prevent the friction which will arise between different localities, such