

tions in the way of guaranteeing the bonds of railways. In return they have got a reduction of freight rates on those roads, which is a great benefit to the people of Manitoba, but which extends also to the people of the west. I believe they have lower passenger rates as well. As I say, the people of the west have benefited by this as well as the people of Manitoba. So, if they have contracted liabilities they have also benefited by those liabilities, and I do not think the people of the west adjacent to Manitoba would object to coming into Manitoba on that consideration. Looking at it from either standpoint, therefore, we find no sufficient reason why the boundaries of Manitoba have not been extended. We have been told that, some years ago, Manitoba was much larger than it is to-day, or was considered to be much larger. When Manitoba was first made up, the eastern boundary was defined as the western boundary of Ontario, and that was thought to be many miles eastward of where it was later determined to be. So, Manitoba lost what she thought was her territory and became a very small province. It is well known to every public man in Canada that Manitobans feel sore over this matter, and I have no doubt this was well known to the premier of this Dominion and those who sat at the council table with him when they framed this Bill. Manitoba expected, when the question of autonomy of the Northwest came up, that they would be dealt with as they thought they deserved. I find that there is little hope that this will be the outcome. They are told that their boundary cannot be extended westward. They have been told, I think, by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) that there is small hope of their boundary being extended northward. As the people of the Territories will not allow any part of the territory north of Manitoba to go to that province, it would be interesting to know just what effort was made by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to uphold the interest of Manitoba on this question. I think he had admitted in this House that he had been consulted with regard to this measure except the educational clauses. I think, that occupying the position he held, that he ought to have taken this House into his confidence and told them why he intended to leave Manitoba with her small boundaries. In the years to come, when our grand-children and great-grand-children, taking their first geography lessons looking at the map and see the little patch painted red—it must be painted red or it would be apt to be overlooked—their sense of proportion will be offended and they will ask about that little spot. Will they be told that this province was made small on account of legislation that they passed in regard to separate schools in days gone by—because the boundaries as fixed will remain

Mr. W. WRICHT

long after separate schools have become a thing of the past in this country, in my humble opinion. I do not think the people in years to come, will continue the condition of affairs that make possible such an agitation as we have in Canada to-day. A great deal of regret has been expressed by hon. members on both sides in regard to this matter. While I do feel a great deal of regret for this, I have more regret for the underlying conditions that make it possible at any time for this flame to burst forth and produce such an agitation as we have at this time. We should look at the cause; we should try to understand the reason. I think there is enough kindness of heart and reasonableness among the people of Canada to-day to make such an agitation impossible if we could once get an understanding with one another. If we could talk to our French Canadian brethren in Quebec, acquire the French language and go down there and express to them our feelings and our convictions with regard to the matter they would look at it differently; and if they could come up among our good Orange brethren in Ontario and talk it over with them, they would not find them the awful people they seem to think they are at the present time.

Now, I find that I am out of accord with the government on the matter of the question of lands. I think that the proper people to handle the lands, both in Manitoba and the Northwest, are the people who live right there, the people who are most interested, the people who would look after those lands and see that they were properly administered, as they are not to-day, in either Manitoba or the Northwest Territories. Now, what is the reason given for withholding the land? We are told that the territorial government would likely squander the lands, or that they would have to sell those lands and thus retard settlement, in order that they might have a revenue. Now I want to point out one fact with regard to that. In a speech delivered in this House by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) the other day, he pointed out that we have been administering those lands in the Northwest at an annual loss to this Dominion during all these years, which losses amount to over a million dollars. Now, if we have lost that much money in handling those lands, could we not well afford to give the people of the Northwest all we are giving them to-day in the way of bounty, and hand over the lands to them, and still save money to the Dominion by doing so? It would not be necessary for the Northwest people to sell their lands in order that they might have sufficient revenue to carry on the affairs of the government. I say it has cost us too much to pursue this immigration policy, and to my mind it would not be the worst thing that ever happened to Canada if the immigration policy was interfered with. I do not think it could very