

ship 38 and 46 per cent north of township 38. In the calculation made by the Minister of the Interior, based upon homestead entries, he estimated five to the family. On this basis, it will be seen that there is an excess of people south of township 38 over those north of that township.

Multiply that number by five and it means that 15,435 more people have gone in south of that township than to the north. The Prime Minister also takes the post office as an indication. To show the absurdity of that contention it is only necessary to quote the district of Athabaska in which there was only one post office up to the 1st of February, 1905, and where they only had twelve mail deliveries during the whole year. This district that had twelve monthly services and one post office up to the 1st February last, is one of the arguments why they are giving more representation to the north than to the south, and they want to give two representatives to that whole district of Athabaska that has only one post office in it. That shows how absurd their contention is, to say nothing at all of the political pull that the member supporting the government has in securing a post office for the district he represents. The same way with the school districts that have been referred to, and the local improvement societies, which are perfectly optional with the settlers, they can establish them or not. Now the district of Athabaska is being given two members, and why? The Prime Minister explains why. In his speech, on page 8006, he says:

The distances are too great, the difficulties of communication are too serious, and therefore these people would have to remain practically unrepresented.

Well there is nothing at all in that argument. They would not have to go unrepresented if they were associated with another riding in the north, they would be equally represented. By enlarging the riding some it would allow these people to be represented just as well as many other constituencies are to-day being represented by members who are now sitting in this House. The Prime Minister goes on:

They could not have the advantage of seeing their member and their member could not see them, and for these reasons we have thought it would not only not be right, but it would not be just and fair that these people should not have the advantage of representation.

Why, I venture to say that there are many members in this House who are representing constituencies so extensive in size that they have never seen portions of them. From 1896 to 1900 I myself had the honour of representing a very large constituency territorially; it extended some 250 or 300 miles north of where I resided, and up to this time I have never seen hundreds of those settlers who reside in the Lake Winnipegosis district, I could not cover the whole region in

the time allowed for the campaign. Still, I did business for these people, they were willing to have me represent them, and elected me as their representative on each occasion. They did not complain much until they were cut off, owing to an increase in the population of the province. As I said before, it is unnecessary to divest these people of representation simply because we refuse to acquiesce in the wish of the government to give them two representatives for that sparsely settled district. And when it is shown what a small population there is in that district, what does the government fall back upon? They do not defend themselves on the ground that there is a sufficient population, but they say: Look at that very large district, look at the area, 300 square miles, or something of that character. If they are going to apply that argument to the portion of Athabaska within the new province of Alberta, should they not apply it to that portion that remains in the new province of Saskatchewan? Are you going to deny representation to that portion within the new province of Saskatchewan? Certainly not. Is it not just as deserving of representation as that portion retained in the province of Alberta? Still, where there were only 241 white people in the whole district in 1901, according to the census, they are giving two representatives, defending themselves on the ground that the territory is so large the members could not see their constituents. Now we have at the present time six members for the territorial assembly according to the redistribution made in this House in 1903. There are six members of the local territorial assembly north of township 38, and there are nine south of that line. Now why is this proportion disturbed? Not because there has been a greater influx of population north, because there has not been; and if there has not been a greater influx north of township 38, why then has this proportion been disturbed? And yet, owing to the fact that there are only six seats north and nine south, we should have a larger number given to the south. The population has gone in since the redistribution was made by this government, and notwithstanding this large population that is in the south in excess of that in the north, they are giving only two of an increase to the south while they are giving seven to the north.

Now we have no means of knowing the number of votes that were polled in Athabaska at the last election, we only know that by the census there were only 241 white people in that district, and we have no means of estimating the present population. The only grounds upon which an estimate can be made is that given by the Minister of the Interior who says that some man in that district told him so. Seriously, can he, as a minister of the Crown, come forward in parliament and state there are 5,000 people at the present time in the district of Athabaska, on the mere fact that some man told