

being gored. I can remember the time when he would not have justified this.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) was not in the House at that time.

Mr. INGRAM. I have been in the House when the hon. gentleman has held forth on this subject very often. If there was anything in which the hon. gentleman really shone, it was in his denunciations of what he called the outrageous gerrymander of the Tory party. The hon. gentleman says I was not in the House. But it was not necessary to be in the House to hear him—I knew people in Montreal who heard him, when he was talking in this House. The hon. gentleman remembers that quite well. I heard him and heard of him in one rural constituency not very far away and not very long ago but he took very good care not to say anything about these schedules. He was not discussing the Autonomy Bill on that line but on another line altogether. He takes good care not to discuss the redistribution made by his own party in this House. The hon. gentleman has swallowed himself on provincial rights the same as he has on redistribution, and I hope my hon. friend will get up before this debate closes and give us his views.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is refreshing to hear the member for West Assiniboia and some of his colleagues when they cannot justify this redistribution on population, fall back on other grounds. The hon. member says that we should not allow that great Athabaska river to go unrepresented, that large area. Some other hon. gentlemen say we have so many grist mills, blacksmith shops, &c., and although they have not the population they want these industries represented and especially the great Athabaska river. They are willing to take population as a basis in the other parts, but in the north where they have not population they fall back on area, but if they are going to take area in the north and in the district of Athabaska in the new province of Alberta, why not apply the same principle in Saskatchewan? You are not giving any representation at all to the Athabaska portion of the new province of Saskatchewan, but two representatives to the Athabaska portion of Alberta. There is nothing fair about that. The minister states it has never been done before, the making of population the basis of redistribution. The hon. gentleman surely has not discarded the old-time doctrines of the Liberal party. I can recall three years ago when the Liberal party in Manitoba assembled in convention on the eve of a local election and passed a number of resolutions making their platform, and one of these was that in the distribution of seats for the local legislature particular importance should be attached to the good old Liberal doctrine of representation by population, and while the Min-

Mr. INGRAM.

ister of the Interior places little importance on that question and says it is only a subsidiary reason we have had no evidence as to the population in this portion of Athabaska. It has been stated by the Minister of the Interior that some one told him it was about 5,000. According to the last census we had 241 whites. This he would increase to 3,000 whites, and we still have not a scintilla of evidence to convince this side of the House, at any rate, that the population has increased to that extent. We are simply asked to take this gentleman's word that the population has increased to that extent. He cannot tell us how many half breeds are in the new district of Saskatchewan, and what proportion of the 3,000 whites in Athabaska is in each province. How then are we to adopt this schedule without more information? The minister seems to be satisfied, but we want some information when a glaring injustice is being perpetrated in giving this district two representatives. The minister has stated that if there was no question of capital there would not be any discussion on Athabaska. I will tell the premier that if Athabaska was situated in the southern portion of the district, with its large area, mills, &c., the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would consider it simply outrageous if the members on this side suggested the idea of having one, let alone two, representatives in that district. It is the hon. gentlemen who have the capital in their minds and desire to fix it beyond recall by legislation. The hon. members say we should anticipate population and the hon. member for Assiniboia states that in the redistribution here in 1903 that was done in the committee on the Northwest Territories. I listened to a great deal of the evidence and never heard one suggestion to that effect. It is true they did not take the census of 1901, but they assumed an increase of population from the taking of the census to the making of the redistribution and that is the way they reached the representation and not on the estimated population for the next four years. We have no reason to anticipate the population of that country. If we had we must apply it all around. We are not supposing that the southern part of the district is going to stand still and all population flock into the north. Hon. gentlemen say that railways are to be built, but it is pointed out that the nearest point, Edmonton, will be 125 miles to the southern part of Athabaska except in the Peace River country. If population comes in there that is not there now and we are willing to assume the population at the present time as a basis for redistribution, but probably we will have in six months' time a session of the provincial legislature, and these settlers who are now coming in along the line of railway will not have a vote until the next election. The