

accepted as true, though it is a mere matter of opinion. Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) is attaching a very high value to his opinions. I have asked him to find anything in the debates or negotiations in any case which showed that area was taken into consideration. I say I do not recollect any such thing.

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy that would be found in the case of British Columbia. They had nothing like the population to warrant the number of representatives given to them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They came in on agreement, and we had not the settling of it. We had to make our bargain with British Columbia, as we did with Prince Edward Island. I think these are not apt illustrations.

Mr. INGRAM. I believe we are all agreed that there should be 25 representatives to each province. No one disputes that, so far as I know. The estimate of population up to the present time is 406,145 for the two provinces. The Minister of Justice estimates that on July 1, there will be 500,000, and we do not dispute that assumption. But the object of this provision, as has been stated, is to provide for the election of the first legislative assembly of the province. If after their election, they choose to redistribute these seats themselves, they can do so, and can dissolve and have an election immediately. Or they can effect the redistribution and have the election later. A redistribution for this House took place in 1893, but the election did not take place until 1896. We had another redistribution in 1902, and an election in 1904. In each case the redistribution took place on the population as it was known to be. But in this case hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to convince us that the redistribution should take account of the probable distribution of population for years hence.

Mr. SCOTT. Why was it that in the last redistribution for this House, the northern portion of this territory, particularly the eastern section, was given a much larger representation than would have been justified by a strict application of the census figures?

Mr. INGRAM. We did that for this parliament which we control. It was our right and our duty.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will permit me to tell him that it was by agreement with his leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) and it was in view of the larger population likely to go into that country on account of railway development.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) makes that assertion, I suppose he remembers about it; but I am bound to say that I do not think it was brought to my attention in that way.

Mr. SCOTT. The greater representation was given. What other reason could there have been for it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My recollection is that we had to delimit ten constituencies. Gentlemen from the Territories met together and they gave us these boundaries, and I understood it was granted as fair distribution of population.

Mr. SCOTT. There were Conservative representatives who agreed to these boundaries. On what principle could they have agreed except that which I have stated?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know they agreed. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has spoken of my adherence to a principle. I say that it is new to me, that I cannot recall it at the moment.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose we did do that. We were doing something with regard to our own House. But we are not in the same condition in meeting a redistribution for the provincial House.

Mr. SCOTT. Surely, if we followed that principle then, we should follow it now?

Mr. INGRAM. But, we are distributing the seats for another legislature. If they do not like our work, they can redistribute and have another election.

Mr. SCOTT. People get tired of elections. They are tired of them in London.

Mr. PATERSON. Let them talk it out.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) takes matters very coolly these days. But I can remember only a few years ago, when all you had to do was to say 'redistribution' and the hon. gentleman would start talking in a voice that, if the door were open could be heard in Montreal, denouncing the wickedness of the Tory redistribution.

Mr. PATERSON. I was only suggesting that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) and the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) should take one of the committee rooms for their back-and-forth discussion and leave the rest of us to vote.

Mr. INGRAM. There was a time also when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was strongly opposed to giving Indians the vote. He thinks now that the Indian is as good as a white man. He can hear redistribution discussed now with perfect good humour. With the hon. gentleman it depends on whose ox is gored. There was a time when he would not have been satisfied with the information that has been laid before the House in support of a redistribution.

Mr. PATERSON. I am quite satisfied.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, the hon. gentleman is satisfied, because it is not his ox that, is