

cant place with a small population. Is it fair to make such a comparison—to compare a city with a village? What tells a tale which bears on this question is a comparison of the number of post offices in two sections of the country such as the northern part and the southern part of Alberta. The number of school sections in one part as compared with the number in another part is also a fair test. Of course, it would not be fair to compare one post office with another; but it is a fair comparison to take two sections with the same areas and inhabited by the same kind of people, and compare the number of post offices in one section with the number in the other. The logical conclusion from such a comparison is that where there are more post offices there are more people. My hon. friend cannot draw any conclusion from the argument, which he made very insidiously, I will not say ingeniously, in which he compared a rural population with an urban population. Then, I instanced the production of grain in the northern district as compared with the production in the southern district. My hon. friend says that is not a fair comparison, because if we compare the east with the west, we shall find much more machinery used in the east than in the west, and therefore the production does not indicate the relative populations. Very true, but we are not comparing the east with the west. We are comparing two western populations which have similar methods of doing their work; and if you find that there is a greater production of grain in one section than in another, you have a right to conclude that there are more people to produce that grain. I have never contended that these tests were strictly accurate, to the point, peremptory and paramount; but my argument is that all these put together tell a uniform tale, and show that there are more people in the north than in the south; and that if so, there ought to be more representation there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If he is going by the people in the north and the south why not go by population entirely?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend rest his case on that?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On the basis of population.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well. I will say to my hon. friend then that by the census of 1901 there were in the 11 districts north of Red Deer 36,398 people and in the 11 districts south of Red Deer 31,034, showing a balance of population in favour of the north of 5,000 by the census of 1901.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the population now taken from the voters' lists, returns of homesteads and everything of that kind?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take the voters' lists, the homestead entries and every-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

thing else of that kind and I will conclude that there are more in the north than there are in the south. Of course the figures cannot be given with absolute accuracy owing to the circumstances of the case but they tell that there is not a sufficient discrepancy between the north and the south to make it the basis of the discussion we have had up to the present time.

Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman twitted my friend here in reference to the statement that he was always professing to follow principles which were advocated by the party opposite and that he never followed them himself. The hon. gentleman says that we are following the same course as is followed in England, that in England there is left to the judges only the power of delimiting the different constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of policy was not decided by the parliament at all; the question of policy was decided by a conference of both parties. That policy was agreed upon and then the matter was submitted to the judges for the purpose of delimiting the constituencies according to that policy. What does the hon. gentleman propose? He says that the admission of Athabaska and Peace River district is a question of policy. That question would not be decided in the imperial parliament at all. That is a fair question for a conference or for the judges to decide. The principles upon which a delimitation is made is a subject for a conference, because the delimitation is made upon principles which are given to the judges for that purpose. In England it was entirely different. Mr. Gladstone meets Sir Stafford Northcote and Lord Salisbury. They agree upon principles upon which the delimitation is to be made or in other words the two parties have a conference and agree upon the policy, but the right hon. gentleman forces down the policy upon the people of this country *nolens volens*. He says: why not give representation to these two territories? No person in this House denies representation to them, adequate representation if necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was denied yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was it?

Mr. HAGGART. Who was it? I never heard a person in the House deny it, that these two portions of the country might be added to the other constituencies and given representation. That would be a fair representation but what we deny is, and what we think is the anomaly and the curiosity in this is, that there is a division between the north and the south; every one knows the reason of that division, each wants the capital, they want a fair show in reference