no justification for giving that district two members.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no dispute between the hon. gentleman and myself. I placed the statement before the House. It was the best I could present under the circumstances as to the population of the district and if the hon. gentleman will do me the honour to accept that statement, even for the purpose of argument he will find, taking the very extreme cases which he did take and which he is entitled to take as a matter of pleading before the House in regard to a case and comparing the estimated population of Athabaska with the estimated population of Calgary, that the representation will stand as four to one as between Athabaska and the city of Calgary. These are the two extreme cases. But, we find in the province of Quebec, not as between an urban and a rural constituency, but as between two urban constituencies, the constituencies of Quebec West and Maisonneuve, that the difference is as six and a half is to one. Now, I presume there were special reasons which governed in that case, because we were through a redistribution in this House not very long ago, and why, if six and a half electors in Maisonneuve are only equal to one in Quebec West, should it be such an outrage and such an unheard of thing that four electors in Calgary should be equal to one in Athabaska in voting power, especially when you consider that that one in Athabaska represents the interests of a territory half as large as all the rest of Alberta.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you extended it up to the North Pole it would be ten times as large.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely, and if the responsibility for the administration of that territory up to the North Pole rested upon the provincial legislature, that fact would have to be taken into consideration in the distribution of seats, but it does not. The argument that is made on the other side of the House is based entirely upon the assumption that population is the only consideration. These gentlemen opposite may look to the history of parliamentary representation in Canada and in every province of Canada, and they will not find a case in which that priciple has been adhered to in fact.

Mr. HAGGART. What are taken into consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. Population is one thing and there are many others. But there is one universal principle and it is that a purely rural population, a population of producers creating wealth in the country is always given a greater share in the government of the country than an equal number of consumers.

Mr. HAGGART. That is so in no place.

Mr. OLIVER. In every place. On what other grounds are the cities of our country so unjustly treated by comparison of population in being under-represented compared with the rural constituencies ?

Mr. LAKE. If that be so, how is it that Prince Albert city is to be given one representative for 769 registered voters, and Souris a country district is to be given one member for 3,346 registered voters ?

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose that will have to be accounted for on much the same principle as hon. gentlemen opposite will have to account for the vast discrepancy between the division of Quebec West and the division of Maisonneuve. There are conditions with which I am not familiar there and elsewhere to account for that. I am not calling into question these conditions, I am stating that there is no departure from principle in establishing corresponding conditions to some extent in this new country.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell me where in Great Britain or any other colony except Canada, the rural population as a matter of principle is given larger representation than the urban population?

Mr. OLIVER. Last night I gave to the House instances of this, selected from the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. HAGGART. I excepted the Dominion of Canada from my question.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not familiar with the principle of representation in other countries. it is enough for me to know what has always been the rule in this country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know where in Canada that principle has ever been applied to a city of the size of Calgary or Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad the hon. gentleman drew my attention to that, but I think we would get along in this debate very much more amicably if there were not so many interruptions, because these interruptions are apt to be met with rather short answers. My reply is that in every place in Canada the number of votes per constituency either for Dominion or provincial purposes is necessarily larger than it is in the Northwest under present conditions. Taking the proportion of votes in these cities to the total vote of the constituencies, the position is exactly the same under the peculiar circumstances of the west as it is in the rest of the Dominion under its circumstances. Let me ask my hon. friend if the case of Calgary is parallel to that of the city of Toronto. I will not say how fair my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) was in making that suggestion, but the difference between the population of Toronto and the population of the different