

ton as the capital rather than Calgary. That is what is at the bottom of the discussion.

Mr. LAKE. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If it be not, then I shall be glad to hear I am in error. But what has been the purport of all this discussion? Why all this discussion between north and south? Why not look at the whole question from the boundary up to the limit of Athabaska rather than to Red Deer north and Red Deer south? If we look at the question on this broad basis, no fault will be found with the divisions. That they are, or can be, mathematical nobody can pretend; but that they are fair I assert in face of all the contradictions we have had in the last two days. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, said a moment ago that we could not take the census as a sufficient basis. I agree with him. We have not taken the census as the only basis, but we have taken also the recorded vote, the registered vote, the post offices, the school districts, and my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has given us in addition the business done by the railways, banks and so on, and I think also the customs duties. I do not object to all these things. They are all fair elements for comparison and to be considered in our endeavour to give representation according to population. My hon. friend said a moment ago that in the committee on which he sat two years ago, they were guided by the census of the population. That is true, but what figures did they follow? They followed the census of 1901. In the old provinces of Canada; we can take the census as the basis of population until we have another census, because we know the population will not vary much from one census to another. There will be a small accession from immigration and the natural increase, but nothing to prevent the census being taken as a basis. In these Territories, however, the conditions are quite different. There we cannot take the census alone but have to supplement it by all the information to which I have just alluded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman himself introduced the question of the two capitals and then charges my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) with having done so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not been here the last two days.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to point out that he was not quite fair. The question was put him with regard to High River, and he referred to its proximity to Calgary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did so because I concluded there must be a large population in High River on account of its being in the vicinity of Calgary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, he referred to its proximity to Calgary, but when my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the proximity of Stony Plain to Edmonton, he charged him with raising the question of rivalry. He is not applying the same principle to each case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is wrong. I said there is a large population at High River because it is in the vicinity of Calgary. My hon. friend from Calgary replied: But Stony Plain is in the vicinity of Edmonton. But, Sir, there is no population in Stony Plain though it is in the vicinity of Edmonton. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it has, but the right hon. gentleman introduced the illustration and thus gave warrant to my hon. friend from Calgary to refer to Stony Plain. Because if you argue that High River should have a population away above the mark because of its proximity to Calgary, it is equally good reason to say that Stony Plain should have a similar increase of population because it is in the vicinity of Edmonton. If the principle be good in the one case, it should in the other. But my hon. friend dismissed that argument with a smile and an entire disregard of logic very refreshing on a warm day like this.

The right hon. gentleman made a great deal of the point that in England judges were not selected. I was under the impression that judges were selected in Great Britain, but if judges were not selected there, men were selected who had the confidence of both parties. The important part of it is that the delimitation was entrusted to an independent commission, and that was done after an agreement as to the principle had been arrived at by both parties. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says it was his own intention to have pursued that course in this case. I very much regret that although I have been pretty steadily in the House since the 1st of February I have heard nothing until to-day of any such suggestion. I have not heard any such suggestion from the right hon. gentleman himself, as he will admit. I have not heard any such suggestion from my friends on this side of the House from the Northwest Territories, and I am inclined to think if they had been cognizant of any suggestion of the kind they would have imparted it to me. The right hon. gentleman says he regrets that that course has not been carried out. Whose fault is that? It is his own fault. These matters are arranged by private interview between the right hon. gentleman and myself or some one on this side of the House, usually between the right hon. gentleman and myself, but I have not heard one word from him or from any other person that this was to be arranged by a conference between the