

at Edmonton, or to help the people of the south to establish it at Calgary. Now, I have gone as carefully as I could into the figures given by the Prime Minister yesterday, and I hope to be able to convince him from his own figures that he has not given every man in the province the same right that he has given to every other man in regard to this first vote. But before coming to that, I wish to say a few words about the side issues, as I may call them. The government have laid before us certain figures with regard to post offices. I submit that the number of post offices has nothing whatever to do with this question. If the government had brought down the amount of revenue derived from the post offices north and south of township 38, I think it would have been some index of the population and of the business carried on in the different sections.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the number of post offices is no index whatever to the number of people who live in the different sections of the country. A comparison was made to-day between the city of Calgary and one of the rural constituencies. Some hon. member from the other side found fault with this comparison, but I submit that a comparison between two rural constituencies would show, not as much difference, but still a vast difference. I know from my own section of the country here that we certainly have some townships eight or ten miles square which have five or six times as many post offices as will be found in another township of the same area, but that does not prove that there are not more people in the second township. That proves nothing, but I would acknowledge that the revenue would have something to do with the question. I would say the same thing in regard to the school district. The government bring down the number of school districts, but they do not bring down the number of the school population. The school population would show a good deal in regard to the population of the district but the number of schools in any given township affords no indication whatever of the number of people in the district. I therefore submit that these two sets of figures brought down are absolutely no use on either side of this argument.

With regard to the population according to the census of 1901, I think the Minister of the Interior will agree with me that it is no index to the number of people in the country to-day or in any part of the country. In other words the stream of immigration varies. The minister himself gave us an instance the other day of a certain part of Alberta where there was an exceptionally large stream of immigration going in. I therefore cannot see that the census figures of 1901 are any more indication as to the proportionate number of people in north and

south Alberta than if the census had not been taken, or had been made up by a clerk in the Agriculture Department here without going into the country at all. The reason I say that is because the difference between the votes polled and the census population in some constituencies is very startling. In Rosebud there were 733 votes polled, and in the census of 1901 only 1,036 people; evidently that township has increased very rapidly. In High River, the one next to it, the votes polled were 1,021 and the census population in 1901, 2,472, showing that it had not increased nearly as fast as Rosebud. In the same way I might go down the list and find many other discrepancies of a similar nature. It therefore seems to me that, in view of the fact that the Northwest has been growing so rapidly and that the growth in different sections has not been equal, it is absolutely impossible to form any judgment whatever from the census of 1901 as to the number of people in the different sections of the proposed province of Alberta to-day. I submit that there are only two sets of figures that are of any value to any practical man in determining the number of people in that province to-day and the chief one is the voters' list of last fall and to a certain extent the number of votes cast. Any other figures, it seems to me, are absolutely useless and only tend to confuse the minds of hon. gentlemen on the matter.

As some side matters have been brought into the discussion I propose to give to the committee some figures which I have here with reference to the receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway during 1903-4 on their lines of railway in the proposed province of Alberta. These figures were prepared by an official of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Northwest, and may therefore be considered as authentic. The first set of figures I have, show the percentage of passenger receipts in 1904 at the six largest places in the proposed province of Alberta. The percentages were as follows:

	Per cent.
Medicine Hat	8.08
Banff	4.87
Macleod	6.83
Calgary	53.88
Lethbridge	8.54
Strathcona	17.78

The only place in the north of Alberta is Strathcona which includes Edmonton and which had 17.78 per cent of the passenger receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the proposed province of Alberta in 1904. If hon. gentlemen opposite are going to bring in outside figures in support of the distribution of constituencies which they propose, I submit that these figures with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway are of far more value than the