age of 846, and 13 seats north of township 34 which on the basis of the vote of last election would have an average of 855 each. I do not think any man who has the honour of being a member of this House will say that is not an absolutely fair division. But take the number of names on the voters' lists which we still contend is the true basis and that basis shows that the suggestion of the leader of the opposition is very partial to the north, because on the voters' lists last autumn there were 15,287 names on the list south of township 34—I have put in one-half of Innisfail—and north of township 34 there were 14,663 names on the list to which I have added 342 votes which it is to be assumed would be in Athabaska according to the Prime Minister's figures, making a total of 15,005 names on the lists north of township 34. The leader of the opposition proposes to give south of township 34, 12 seats, each having an average of 1,274 names on the list, and north of 34, 13 seats each having an average of only 1,154 names on the list. The plan of the leader of the opposition would give to the north an average of 120 votes less per seat than in the south. That is proof positive that we are simply suggesting a plan that would give fair-play both to the north and to the south. Now, the government proposes to give seven seats in the extreme north each of which has an average of 892 names on the voters' lists, while they put seven seats in the south each of which has an average of 1,540 names on the list. As against that the leader of the opposition's plan is to have 12 seats south of township 34 with an average of 1,274 and 13 seats north of township 34 with an average of 1,154 on the list. These figures ought to show the justice of our plan to any independent man. I have endeavoured to make these calculations as carefully as possible from the figures given by the government, and I have shown that the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition can in no sense be said to favour the south, but on the contrary it is partial to the north to a slight extent because it gives one seat to Athabaska with an exceedingly small population.

Mr. SCOTT. Hon. gentlemen opposite in all the calculations they make apply a rule that never before was applied in Canada under similar circumstances. The calculations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) are based on a strict mathematical rule with regard to that new portion of Alberta which comprises fully one-half or more of the province. Was such a strict mathematical rule applied to Manitoba when she was brought into confederation ? No. Manitoba got four seats in this parliament when she had only a population of 17,000. Here in Athabaska we have a new portion of the province, unorganized, practically without the ordinary means of communication up to the present, but still a country where there has been considerable development already. To such a country hon. gentlemen opposite seek to apply this strict mathematical rule. What was done in 1887 when the Northwest Territories were given representation in this parliament ? Was the same mathematical rule applied ? No, certainly not. The Territories got four members in this parliament at a time when the mathematical rule probably would not have permitted of more than two. And so with British Columbia when she was brought into confederation. British Columbia got six representatives in this parliament when I dare say the strict application of the mathematical rule would not have permitted one-half of that number. It seems to me that our friends (Mr. Oliver and Mr. Talbot) who are contending for adequate representation for that portion of Athabaska which is to be within the new province, ought to be surprised at their own moderation. If representation is to be given at all, it is absurd to propose to give a lesser representation than is provided for in these schedules, or to say that the vast Athabaska district watered by the Athabaska river should have less than one member, and that the vast Peace River district watered by the Peace River should have less than one member.

Mr. PERLEY. When this parliament was giving federal representation to the Northwest Territories, it was dealing with its own business, and it could do what it liked. If Alberta were a province and she wished to give undue proportionate representation to any part of that province, it would be her own business. But this is not a matter for ourselves, it is a matter that has been forced upon us on account of the conditions existing, and I ask my hon. friend in all fairness whether in view of the contentions between the north and south we can proceed to make this division in any fairer way than by applying what he calls the mathematical rule as nearly as we can in reason.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the main question in this discussion ; is it the question of the capital of Alberta ?

Mr. PERLEY. That is not the main question with me ; my chief object is to try and make fair divisions. I am told there is a dispute as to whether the capital shall be north or south——

Mr. SCOTT. What other contentions could there be between north and south ; is not that the whole question ?

Mr. PERLEY. That may be so, but that is not a question which we should take sides on. If the province of Alberta had her own legislature and she chose to divide and give undue proportion to the northern area that is her own business exactly as it was our business, when in distributing the constituencies for the Dominion we chose to give the Northwest an undue proportion.