

knew then, as the House knows now, that he was not in his cabinet and was not in his administration. What is the reason of all this? This autocratic Prime Minister that we have in this country eight years ago using the words of Bismarck said: We shall not go to Canossa. The right hon. gentleman has been to Three Rivers; he has made the treaty of Three Rivers, and in pursuance of that treaty he has chosen in his autocratic way to bring down a Bill dealing with the great questions now at issue without consulting his colleagues. It is said that in the preparation of this Bill he consulted only three of his ministers, of whom two came from his own province of Quebec. I do not propose to discuss the Bill, but I know now why the Minister of the Interior has left the government; it is now known that it is on the school question and it is on the land question as I said on Monday—but it is more. The right hon. gentleman in introducing a certain measure in this House argued on three grounds, the constitutional ground, the ground of policy, and he argued for separate schools per se and it is because the proposition is for separate schools per se that the late Minister of the Interior has had to leave the administration.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) intends to conclude with a motion)

Mr W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I have certainly the right to speak somewhat from the standpoint of privilege, but I intend to conclude with a motion. There is another thing in regard to this question. There is a good old verse in the Bible which says that all they who take to the sword shall perish by the sword; and I say that all those who take to provincial rights and school questions will die by provincial rights and school questions. The handwriting is on the wall.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, and the right hon. gentleman has lost not only his Minister of the Interior, the Napoleon of the West, but that panegyrist of his, who set the right hon. gentleman up as the greatest statesman we have ever had in this country, and who glorified the late Minister of the Interior as the Napoleon of the West. The two of them are now joined together against the right hon. gentleman. He has lost his chief organ, the Toronto 'Globe,' or this question; he has lost the Montreal 'Witness,' another of his organs; and I am afraid that he is now about to repudiate the last organ he appears to have left, 'Le Soleil,' that organ which, in its pontifical way, said the other day: 'We are the organ of Sir Wilfrid, and every one must take note of it and govern themselves accordingly.'

I now come to the question of the school lands and the way little Manitoba is treat-

ed; and again I call the attention of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who is now in his place, to this declaration of the leading organ of the right hon. gentleman, that it was the intention to punish Manitoba because she had vindicated provincial rights in connection with educational matters. The province of Manitoba has an area of only 74,000 square miles, while the proposed provinces are to have an area of nearly 300,000 square miles each. But the province of Manitoba happens to be in favour of public education, and she is to be punished; and now the House and the country will be able to see how all this came about. If you extended the limits of the province of Manitoba to the west, the result would be that the portion of territory to the east would have the right to regulate its own educational affairs, while the other portion of the same territory would be shackled. That is the reason why Manitoba is being punished. And so it turns out, after all the taunts that I was met with here on Monday, that I was right when I said that Manitoba was being punished, and that the Dominion Lands Act would have to be changed in order to carry out the proposal made in the Bill. I was given what was called a categorical denial; but to-day I have received a categorical affirmation from the late Minister of the Interior, I warn the right hon. gentleman that he is engaged in a quixotic career if he fancies that he and his party, which claims to be the party of provincial rights, can shackle the two new provinces of the west and impose a separate school system upon them without consulting the people. He does not consult his own ministers—the confession is made to-day. And what is to be the fate of that minister who to-day declares that he has not been consulted? He is to be Tartified and Blairified, like the other ministers who have resigned; and the same fate awaits any one else who chooses not to come under this new czarism which we have in this country, under which not even a cabinet minister is to be consulted in regard to public policy; under which that great free west, which feels more keenly on these great public questions than we do in the east, is not to be consulted through its recognized minister, but this hasty and ill-advised proposal is to be introduced into this House in his absence.

I congratulate the late Minister of the Interior upon having the courage to come out. I can say this at least of him, that he has justified to-day that mission which he made several years ago into my own province, into the county of Haldimand, to say that he came to the province of Ontario to ask for our sympathy because it was proposed to put shackles upon his province; because, he said, if the province of Manitoba is shackled to-day, the time will come when the greater provinces to