

cona that in ten cases, I think, in the four electoral districts of Alberta, the number of votes polled overran the number of votes on the list, is sufficient evidence that the votes on the list are not an accurate guide to the number of the population, and the lists are not at all in the same position as the voters' lists in this part of the country where they are made up on a different basis. In the Northwest the enumerator is appointed immediately before the election, whose duty it is to place upon the list the names of those within the polling division who he believes are entitled to vote. He may see these people or he may not; and in the result of the vote it makes no difference whether a man's name is on the list or not, if he is a voter he is entitled to go to the poll, and by taking the oath, to cast his vote. That being the case, it is evident that the same care is not taken in making up the voters' lists that would be taken were the voters' lists the final test. In this part of Canada, candidates and members go to the expense of hundreds and thousands of dollars to get a correct voters' list, because that is the final test of the right to vote. But in the Northwest Territories the voters' lists are not the final test at all. Nobody goes to any expense to prepare a list, and the lists are consequently notoriously inaccurate so far as they represent the actual voting population. When we proposed to provide for a delimitation of the districts it was not with an intention of depriving any one of his right to vote that we took the basis of the votes cast rather than the basis of those on the list, but it was because we felt that the votes cast would be accepted by everybody as the more accurate indication of the number of voters available in the district.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman know what percentage of non-registered voters attended at the polls?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

Mr. BARKER. We want to know whether any material number voted who had not been on the list; and next, did not that apply to every one of the constituencies, so as not to affect the average.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course.

Mr. BARKER. Then what difference does it make, as the list would give the true average after all?

Mr. OLIVER. It might and it might not, there is no assurance of it. The assurance is much better when you rely upon the ballots in the box than upon the names on the list, prepared as those lists are.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman forgets. There may be 30, or 40 or 50 per cent on the list that do not vote at all; but there may be only 1 per cent or 2 per cent who have voted that were not on the list. One is 1 or 2 per cent from the accurate

figure, the other may be 30, 40 or 50 per cent off.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If the minister thinks that the better basis is the number of votes polled rather than the number on the list, how comes it that, according to the government's own figures submitted to this House, in the eleven southern constituencies there were 10,566 votes polled and 15,895 on the list? Which is the better gauge of population? The same way in the north.

Mr. BARKER. That shows a difference of 50 per cent. If the hon. minister will now tell us what the percentage was that voted who were not on the list, we will be able to say whether the list of voters, or the number who voted is the better guide.

Mr. LAKE. In the only case that came to my notice there was an equality between the names on the list and the number of those who voted, it was a case in which there was a duplicate of names on one of the lists. Two lists were supplied, and on the list which had evidently been used there was a duplicate of names. I did not find a single case in the large number of lists I looked through, in which there was a larger number of votes polled than of names on the list, and I looked more or less at the lists of six constituencies in the Northwest Territories. I was glad just now to hear the minister quoting from the census figures, showing he had looked them up. This afternoon I asked him the question as to what number he estimated the half-breed population in the eastern half of Athabaska to be. I think that is information that we might demand at this stage. The schedules for the new province of Saskatchewan have been drawn up, no doubt, after the minister had inquired very closely into the details of the population in that new province. I would like to ask him how many of the white and half-breed population in the district of Athabaska he places in the eastern part which is to go into the new province of Saskatchewan, and how many were there according to the census of 1901?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not prepared to answer that question, the return is not in my department. I will be glad to get the information and present it to the House, if desired.

Mr. LAKE. At any rate, the hon. gentleman might tell us how many whites and half-breeds he estimates are in the eastern part, as the schedules for Saskatchewan have been drawn up and submitted.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give any estimate. I have been careful, on the request of the hon. member for North Toronto, to secure from the Census Department a complete statement of the whites and half-breeds on the one hand and of Indians on the other, in the district affected by the Bill under discussion. If I had been asked to