

consideration, but which the hon. gentleman has ignored. He has not said a word about the population shown by the census of 1901, though that is one of the sources of information which we have placed before the House. Now, if it is true that the figures he has placed before the House show that there are more people in the south than in the north, it is equally true that according to the figures of the census of 1901 there are more people in the north than in the south. I have already placed these figures before the House. But I will do so again. The figures show that in 23 constituencies in the old district of Athabaska there were, in 1901, 69,441 people. Now, take off the constituency of Red Deer which, for the purpose of comparison, we have eliminated, and which has been eliminated by the hon. gentleman, this constituency containing 2,009 being eliminated, would leave 67,432. Dividing that population by 22 constituencies, and it gives you a little more than 3,000 for each one. If we apply that unit or average to the 11 constituencies north of Red Deer you have about 10 members, and if you apply the same process to the 11 constituencies south you would have something like 12 members. The population of the 11 constituencies north of Red Deer was 36,398, while the population of the 12 constituencies south was 31,000. Therefore, if you divide by the unit of 3,000 the 11 constituencies south of Red Deer that will give you about 10, and if you apply the same calculation to the 11 constituencies north of Red Deer that will give you more than 12. Therefore, if, on the other hand, his figures tell one story, on the other hand our figures tell another story. Therefore, it seems to me that under the circumstances we must come to the conclusion that there are more people in the north than in the south. The census shows that, the post office shows that, the school districts show that; therefore it seems to me the case is fairly made out. I do not think that even the argument of my hon. friend, if applied to the amendment of the leader of the opposition can have any bearing upon the discussion. The hon. gentleman has proposed a new method of disposing of the question. My opinion is that the best way we can dispose of it is to take the constituencies one by one and see whether they can be improved or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman seems to miss absolutely the main point of the remarks of my hon. friend from St. Antoine division, Montreal (Mr. Ames). There has been a disposition in dealing with the delimitation of those constituencies to regard what was formerly the unorganized district of Athabaska as separated in some way from the new province of Alberta. It is absolutely fallacious to look at the question from that standpoint. The unorganized territory is a part of the new province of Alberta, and in delimiting the ridings of that province it must be so regarded. We  
Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

will start with that as a first proposition. What is the information before the House at present as to the population of that district? It is proposed by the measure which the government has introduced, by the schedules which they have brought down, to give two members to what was formerly that unorganized territory; one-twelfth of the representation of the whole province is by this measure assigned to what was formerly an unorganized district. So far as I am aware, it did not have any representation in parliament or in the legislature. One-twelfth of the whole representation of a province of 250,000 is to be given to what was formerly an unorganized territory, having upon an outside and undoubtedly an exaggerated estimate a population of only 5,000, and hitherto without representation either in the Dominion parliament or in the legislature of the Territories. Well, there must be some ground for that measure, we must find some substantial reason for it. This is a part of the new province of Alberta, and is entitled to just the same consideration, no less and no more, than any other portion of that province. Its people are as much entitled to representation, they are no more entitled and no less entitled than the people of any other part of the province of Alberta.

Now, the right hon. gentleman refers to the census of 1901. It is idle for him to refer to the census of 1901. If, for one moment, we assumed that Bill is to be framed on the basis of that census, it is perfectly plain that the people in the unorganized territory would not be entitled to two representatives, because there were then in that district only 1,710 whites and half-breeds together, or about 342 votes. Proceeding on the basis of the census of 1901, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is absolutely out of court, so far as this unorganized territory is concerned. But we have not been going on the basis of the census of 1901. In every other portion of the Bill—in fixing the revenue, in fixing the per capita allowance, in everything outside of section 12—we proceed on other information than that of the census. The information brought down by the government, on which they proceed, was a statement made up showing the estimated population as in January last, and what it is expected to be on July 1st next. Therefore, we might as well dismiss the census of 1901, though, if we stood by that census, there would be absolutely no warrant whatever for assigning to the new territory the representation which is assigned to it by this Bill. The population of the province was 70,000, according to the census of 1901, and the population of the unorganized territory was 1,710. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) sees at once that there would not be a shadow of argument, on the basis of the census of