

is settled? It is a matter of common knowledge that people will make homestead entries where they can get them, all along the proposed line of the Canadian Northern, and where the Grand Trunk Pacific is expected to pass. There are hon. gentlemen in this House, I know, who have made homestead entries in that country; a man can reside in the province of Ontario and have his entry made any time after the 1st of September, and it is not necessary that he should see the land at all until the beginning of the following June. Then time runs on and no steps are taken to cancel the entry unless some one complains to the homestead inspector. So you will find speculative homestead entries where it is supposed railways are going to pass. So much for homestead entries.

If we take the land sales by the government it will be found that of the even or odd-numbered sections sold to actual settlers in the last three years, 54 per cent are south of line 38 per cent and 46 north. That is another indication of the trend of settlement. If we follow up the inquiry to the land office, let us take the moneys that have been received in cash and scrip at the different land offices, always remembering that you have in the southern part of the country half of the agency of Red Deer. The figures for the year ending the 1st of June, 1904, are: Edmonton office, \$38,711; Red Deer, \$16,392; Calgary, \$56,741; Lethbridge, \$86,046. In other words, 22 per cent of that was north of 38 and 78 per cent south. Is not that a fair indication of where settlement is going in that country? Let us take another example. Look at the receipts for land, timber and registry office fees, and see if they do not tell the same story, namely, that the influx of population and the development are mostly in the south. The receipts from 1891 to 1901 from land, timber and registry office fees, were: North of 38, \$253,795, or 34 per cent; south of 38, \$538,516 or 66 per cent. For 1902-3, the receipts from the above sources were: North of 38, \$174,417, or 34 per cent; south, \$330,998, or 66 per cent. The receipts from the beginning to 1903, from all three sources were: North, \$529,354, or 27 per cent; south, \$1,429,182 or 73 per cent. Yet we are told that the division is fair as between the north and the south. If we adhered to the principle adopted by the legislative assembly, you would have fifteen seats south of 38 and ten north, or as nine to six—If you adhered to that principle, and as I have said, there has been no complaint made with regard to those constituencies in the local House.

Now, I have only been dealing with the rural population, but if we take the urban population from the very best sources of information we can get, we will find a greater influx of population, urban as well as rural, has been to the south. I have the figures here taken from Waghorn's

Guide for the month of February for every village, hamlet and town. I have them figured out with respect to the local constituencies, but in order to save time I will not give them in detail. If any constituency is questioned, I am prepared to give the urban population in each one. The result is that south of the line there is a urban population of 42,550; whilst to the north there is only 21,300, a difference of 21,150 or 75 per cent south and 25 per cent north. I do not think that the strongest advocate of the northern country will contend that we have a larger urban population north than we have in the south. Now if you add these two together you find a total urban population of 63,750. As I understood the Minister of Justice some three or four weeks ago in this House, he said that he assumed the population of the province of Alberta was 173,000, instead of as now, 250,000. If he took the two together there were 500,000, and an estimate had been made up which will be found in the 'Hansard,' that Alberta showed a population of 173,000. Now that tallies with the percentage of urban population shown in the census of 1901, as near as any person can get at the figures. But that is one of the reasons why I would like to see this whole matter referred to an independent commission where full and complete inquiries could be made, so that every locality would have an opportunity of being represented and stating its case. Proceeding on the figures suggested by the Minister of Justice, of 173,000, that leaves a balance of about 105,000 exclusive of Indians, of a rural population. The question arises, in what part of the country is the bulk of that rural population? It is impossible to determine anything definite in regard to that. As I have pointed out, homestead entries are made up there in great numbers by people who have no idea of ever settling upon the land. But when we cannot get any accurate information, we have to do the next best thing we can. I have a map here which was prepared for the government two years ago, made up to the 1st of December, 1902.

On it are laid down in the proposed province of Alberta the townships that are largely settled and those that are sparsely settled. It would be interesting to have this map on the table of the House, and it is a marvel to me that an attempt is to be made to put this distribution through with such a lack of evidence before the House. This is a very important matter to the people of that western province. It may be considered a small or a light matter which can be put through down here by getting up and saying: We do not divide the constituencies up according to the vote but according to a combination of the vote and other sources of information furnished by our two friends from the north. The question should not be disposed of upon any such evidence as that. In the preparation of this map