

it in the very best possible way, starting it on its course under the best possible circumstances, and endeavouring to see that it is not restrained in any way from putting into force those elements of life that it contains.

There is no doubt that many features of this measure deserve our very careful consideration. In the first place, with regard to the naming of the two provinces which have been set up, no fault can be found. As to the division of the territory, there is little new that can be said. The objection raised by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), as to the dividing line between the two provinces, and his suggestion that it would have been wise to have placed it some sixty miles further east, is worthy of notice. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the territory to say whether or not that would be a desirable move. I think the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) also dwelt upon that point. Therefore, if these two gentlemen think it desirable that that should be changed, I think that even yet it might be wise to reconsider that feature of the Bill.

A further difficulty which has arisen in connection with the division of the territory is the claim set up by the sister province of Manitoba to a share in the vast heritage that lies to the west of her. I think Manitoba is worthy of better consideration than it has received so far at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the contentions which Manitoba has set up for further territory are valid, and that they should by all means be considered with a view to satisfying the demands of that comparatively small province. Manitoba should not be left to feel that she has a grievance on her hands; but, judging by the reports which we receive and the utterances of her public men, we are forced to the conclusion that Manitoba really considers that she has not been properly treated in the division of territory at present being dealt with by this House. If that is the case, and I rather think it is, it should not yet be too late for hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to see to it that nothing is allowed to stand in the way of Manitoba receiving that justice which she has a right to expect. Manitoba, it is true, has been a province for a good many years. The right hon. the First Minister has stated that up to the present he has not known that Manitoba desired her boundaries extended, though on further information from the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) the other day, the right hon. gentleman admitted that a petition had been received a few years ago praying for their extension. This petition, it appears, was not favourably received at the time; it was pigeon-holed; and the matter was not dealt with. What could be more natural, now that the territory is being divided, than that Manitoba should

renew the claim which she had made on a previous occasion, when the right hon. gentleman had not heard her prayer? Manitoba is surrounded by immense areas with at present a comparatively sparse population. In the territory to the north of Manitoba, between the province and Hudson bay, there is probably not more than one person to five square miles. Whatever the population is, its rights ought of course to be considered; and if the people have any good reason for not wishing to link their fortunes with Manitoba, that ought to be considered. But in this debate no reason has been given why the territory of Manitoba should not be extended to the north and also to the west. My own view, formed from reading of the wishes of the people of the Northwest, has been that there should be only one new province formed, and that the balance of the territory between it and the province of Manitoba should be given to Manitoba. We know that the matter of provincial government is an item of serious cost to all the smaller provinces of the Dominion. There is nothing that can be said against the division of our territory into larger areas. The cost of our government is heavy; this country suffers from an excess of provincial governments, and it would have been good policy, in dividing these vast areas in the west, to have avoided the mistake of the past of having a number of small provinces each supporting its own House of parliament and dealing with matters within its own boundaries, and thus imposing upon the people, in addition to the federal taxation, a large tax for the support of the local government for which they are responsible.

The drawback in our system of having too many local legislatures and governments, is one we might easily have avoided in the Territories. No one would have been the sufferer, so far as I can see, and I really think that the prayer which the province of Manitoba has seen fit to send this government has not received the attention from this House to which it is justly entitled. I think that Manitoba has a very serious grievance, and I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will not persist in turning a deaf ear to her prayer for increased territory. Whether or not we have got at the bottom of the reasons which have prevented that province from having her claims given that attention which they deserve, I am not quite sure, but I trust that the statements in the press in that connection are not well founded. I trust that it cannot be shown that the school laws of Manitoba are the ground on which her request for increased territory has been refused. If that should be the case, I think that a situation is being created which will lead to serious trouble. If Manitoba is deprived of her rights simply because she has not established that class of educational institutions, which some hon. gentlemen in this