

from the government map. Maple Creek is an enormous district in area, and I think it would be fair to cut it down a little, and so I propose to take off three ranges from the easterly edge and throw these three ranges into the district of Moosejaw. I think the district of Moosejaw can very well stand the addition of these three ranges. I change the northern boundaries of the districts of Maple Creek and Moosejaw from the north line of township 27 to the north line of township 26, thus taking an additional line of townships off Maple Creek and off Moosejaw and adding that line of townships to the northern districts, Battleford, Saskatoon and Batoche. Coming to the other part of the map I propose to add a range line to the district of Moosomin on the west side, taking it off the district of Whitewood. Coming over to the district of Wolseley I propose to take a range line off Grenfell and add it on to Wolseley, and then throw the districts of Whitewood and Grenfell into one. Thus I propose to make four districts into three. I propose to remedy the grievance with regard to Souris and Cannington by cutting off four ranges from the west of these districts. Then I propose to draw a line through the district of South Qu'Appelle on the north line of township 10. These portions taken off the districts of Cannington, Souris and the south part of Qu'Appelle will form a new Soo line district, according to the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lake).

Mr. LAKE. How far west does that district go?

Mr. SCOTT. I propose also to take two ranges off the district of South Regina. By this map South Regina would lose two ranges on the east side up as far as the north line of township 10. I have already said that we should not go on the population of last census as a basis, and I do not think it would be fair to go entirely on the vote last fall. I think the committee will agree with me that possibly the fairest basis that can be obtained is to take the census population together with the homestead entries that have been made in the various parts of the country since the census was taken four years ago; calculate that each entry is worth so many people, say three if you like; multiply each homestead entry by three, and by that means we will arrive fairly at what is the present population of these various parts of the country. Does my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle suggest that that is not a fair method?

Mr. LAKE. Certainly it is not a fair basis, to consider that a homestead entry in a new district will bring as many people into the country proportionately as a homestead entry in an old district. It is not a fair basis for showing the increase of the population.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the committee will agree with me that it is an approximately

fair basis. We cannot arrive at the absolute facts with regard to the present population of that country. If we find a number of homestead entries in a particular area, and calculate that each entry will account for a certain number of people, and apply the same rule in all parts of the country we shall not be very far out. I find that in these four districts of Moosomin, Whitewood, Grenfell and Wolseley, which my hon. friend thinks is so unfair to suggest should be thrown into three, there was a census population in 1901 as follows: Moosomin, 5,163; Whitewood, 3,733; Grenfell, 3,956; Wolseley, 4,059; making a total of 16,911. There have been homestead entries in these four districts since the census was taken as follows: In Moosomin, 631; in Whitewood, 690; in Grenfell, 1,038; in Wolseley, 1,131; a total of 3,490. Now, I propose to multiply these homestead entries by three, and I get this result—that the homestead entries mean an addition to the population in these four districts since the census was taken of 10,470. Add that to the census population, we get 27,421 as an estimated present population in these four districts. I may say that these four districts cast an aggregate vote last fall of 5,071. If we make them into three districts, we shall have a population unit of 9,140, and an average vote cast last fall in each of the three districts of 1,690. Now, my hon. friend objected very strongly to my proposition to make four districts out of Souris, Cannington and Qu'Appelle. I am going to present the same calculation in regard to them. The census population of these three districts in 1901 was as follows: Souris, 5,704; Cannington, 3,485; Qu'Appelle, 5,530; a total of 14,719. There have been homestead entries made in these districts as follows: In Souris, 2,998; in Cannington, 2,354; in Qu'Appelle, 2,865; a total of 8,217, as against a total of 3,490 in my hon. friend's four districts. Multiply this total of homestead entries by three, and we get an estimated increase of population in these three districts of 24,651. Add that to the total census population of 14,719, and we get a present estimated population for these three districts of 39,370 as against 27,421 in my hon. friend's four districts which I propose to make into three. Now, if I make these three districts into four, there will be a population unit for each of the four districts of 9,842 as against a population unit of 9,140 for each of the three districts which I make out of the four districts of my hon. friend; and I find that last fall we had an average vote in each of the four districts which I make out of these three districts of 1,889 as against an average vote in each of the three districts which I make out of my hon. friend's four districts of 1,690. Does my hon. friend tell me that that is not fair? Does he tell me that the suggestion he has made is a more equitable one? His districts are less in area, less in votes cast, less in