

you come to the population which, after all, is the great test, the advantage is with the north.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does that include Indians?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. But the Indians would be either included or excluded in both cases, so that, for purposes of comparison, there would be no advantage either way. Now, there are more post offices in the north than in the south. According to the figures placed in my hands there were 140 post offices in the north and 125 in the south, making a difference of 15. I may be told that this is not material to the issue. I do not pretend that it is absolutely material, but it should be given its due weight.

Mr. INGRAM. The Prime Minister's figures with regard to the post offices do not agree with those of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to be sure about those post offices. Do I understand that the number south of Red Deer is 140?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will give the figures exactly as I have them. In the district of Edmonton there are 60 post offices and in Strathcona of 95—a total of 155. In the district of Calgary there are 54, in the district of Alberta 46, Medicine Hat 10—a total of 110. Taking 15 from Strathcona and adding them to the south, I get 140 for the north and 125 for the south.

Mr. FOSTER. Either the right hon. gentleman confuses the north and south or I do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall not discuss that point with my hon. friend, but will leave it to the Minister of the Interior. The object we had in mind was this. Since we must have a division north and south, is there a greater population in the former than in the latter? I say that all the facts that I have given go to show that there is more in the north, except the recorded and the registered votes. As to these, I admit the advantage is with the other side, but every other source of information goes to show that there are more people in the north. Let me give further information upon that point. I shall take the statistics which have been given here on another subject. My hon. friend yesterday took the trade of certain sections and compared the trade of the north with that of the south. Let me compare the agricultural products of the two. In 1903 the wheat produced in the north was 675,576 bushels and in the south 533,000 bushels; oats, 3,200,000 bushels in the north and in the south 1,921,000 bushels; barley, 746,000 bushels in the north and in the south 325,000 bushels. This shows a decided preponderance of agricultural products in the north.

Mr. COCHRANE. How does the production of cattle compare in the two?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought my hon. friend would put this question and that his own friends would be sorry. The number does not compare at all; it is altogether in favour of the south, because the south is better adapted to the production of cattle and not so well adapted for the production of cereals and other agricultural products. If my hon. friend wants to give votes to cattle, let him do so; but if he wants to give votes to men, he will have to give the preponderance to the north. Wherever you find a great many cattle, you do not find many men. The south is peculiarly a ranching and grazing country, and consequently has more cattle and less population than the north. I do not take the cattle into account, because they are not a fair indication of the population, whereas agricultural products are. All these things go to show that there are more people in the north than in the south.

Mr. HERRON. What year is the right hon. gentleman giving the statistics for?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 1903.

Mr. HERRON. Have you the yield per acre?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have not.

Mr. HERRON. I have it here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there is an argument in the yield per acre, my hon. friend will have all the benefit he can find in it. I now come to another point put by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), the point with regard to the two constituencies in the north. There is a small population in the north, I admit; but are they to be represented or not? We were told yesterday to annex it to some existing constituency. But are you to annex to constituencies, which are as large as a man can serve, a territory three or four times the size of any constituency in the Northwest? You must give these people representation. They are British citizens, and have a right to be represented. In fact, the whole thing hedges upon the selection of the capital. If it were not for that, we would not have this discussion at all. If there were in the south a preponderance of numbers so as to discredit the comparison we make between the north and the south, not a word would be said against these men having representation. It has always been the policy in this House to give representation to large districts, even though their population be small and sparse. Take the county of Gaspé, which has been given representation since confederation, even when it had but a small population of fishermen. Take Chicoutimi and Saguenay, which has been given representation since sixty years ago, when it had not a population worth speaking of. Take the very Northwest Territories, which were given representation in 1887 that they