

the Manitoba government on the school question. To that point I wish to address myself for a moment. I was requested by the First Minister to attend the meeting of the 17th of February at which were present the gentlemen named by him. I did not know before going the object of the meeting. I was aware that the Manitoba government had sent to this administration a memorial requesting, among other things, the extension of its boundaries northward to Hudson bay. The words of the memorial are literally 'northward to Hudson bay.' I attended that meeting and there were present Mr. Colin Campbell, Mr. Rogers, the premier and perhaps the Minister of Justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Justice was not present, so far as my recollection goes, during the time I was there. A few minutes after I arrived Mr. Rogers,—who was the only minister from Manitoba who spoke—explained that his government desired the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba easterly to the Hudson bay and northerly. The memorial said northerly, and when he explained that they desired an extension easterly to Hudson bay, so as to include territory at the mouth of the Churchill river and the Nelson river, I at once observed that he was asking to extend the territory of Manitoba easterly in a direction which would perhaps interest the province of Ontario as well. Up to that moment, when it was only proposed, so far as the memorial went, to extend Manitoba northerly,—although they may have intended north easterly to come out at Hudson bay—it did not occur to me that the desire was to go to the mouths of those two rivers. Therefore so soon as that object was known to me, I said that the province of Ontario would have the right to be heard before we could adjudicate upon that point or form any opinion upon it. Mr. Rogers took the ground that the province of Ontario had no right or claim to any territory lying north of that province and adjacent to Manitoba's easterly limit, and therefore had no right to be heard. I controverted that view and explained that I could not agree to it. He said if you will allow me I can satisfy you that Ontario has no right to be heard. I replied that it would be a waste of time to try and convert me on that point and that, speaking as a minister from the province of Ontario, I must insist upon that province being heard before this question is gone into.

I did not succeed in influencing the Manitoba representatives and I turned to the premier and informed him that, as a minister coming from Ontario, I was not prepared to discuss these questions affecting the rights of Ontario until the government of that province was present and could submit its case. Upon that statement I withdrew from the meeting, and I am told

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

that the claim for extension to Hudson bay then and there ceased for the time being. I take the ground to-day, as a minister from Ontario, without expressing any opinion as to how the territory should be divided, that our province is entitled to an opportunity to present its case before the parliament of Canada deals with it. In my opinion it is quite possible to make a fair distribution, so that Ontario may be able to acquire a deep sea harbour and Manitoba be similarly equipped on the Hudson bay. Our territory extends to James bay but I believe James bay is shallow and not suitable for ocean navigation, whereas when you go to the west coast of Hudson bay, you have two possible ports, one at the mouth of the Nelson river, which with dredging may be made a very good sea harbour, and it might be regarded by the two provinces as a fair division of territory if Manitoba were given a harbour at mouth of the Churchill river and Ontario at Nelson river. That was the idea that went through my mind when I heard of this claim; and so far as the Papal Ablegate is concerned, the statement made in this newspaper is the first intimation I have that he took any part in the adjustment of the boundaries of Ontario. Long before the interview in question, I had given, so far as a minister from Ontario could do so, a decision as to the attitude I assumed on that question, and that was that until the province of Ontario could be heard, no conclusion could be come to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) I have very little to say in respect of what has fallen from the Prime Minister. I am glad to know that the Prime Minister to-day has not adhered to that reticence which has characterized him on similar occasions in the immediate past, and I suppose that it might be fair to assume, that if he had as good a case with respect to the ignoring of his Minister of the Interior and his Minister of Finance in regard to important measures as that which he has made to-day, with regard to the matter with which he has dealt, he would have given us an explanation that has not yet been made with reference to the introduction of this Bill without even consultation with these two gentlemen. It is gratifying to know that although two members of his own government could not be consulted with regard to the provisions of this Bill, the Postmaster General has been so strenuous in his advocacy of the rights of his province of Ontario that the ministers of that province had to be consulted. However, there is an old proverb that charity well understood begins at home, and possibly the rights of ministers to be heard with regard to important matters to be dealt with by parliament may be extended not only to the provincial ministers of Ontario, but to ministers of this very administration.