

must consult Ontario, and even must consult the new province of Saskatchewan—but must not consult his own Minister of the Interior. Apparently, he did not submit this question to the responsible representative of the west, his own Minister of the Interior, for I cannot and will not believe that that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) representing, as he does, a Manitoba constituency, and knowing the wishes unanimously expressed of the people of his own province—for this has not been a party question—would agree to have the representations of Manitoba turned down as they have been, and her request refused on the ground that these other provinces must be consulted, even though Manitoba's boundaries might be extended without trespassing upon a single foot of territory belonging to any of these provinces. I think we shall have to look to the press of the right hon. gentleman to find out the reason. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has told us already that the press supporting the right hon. gentleman has given the reason away. I do not know whether these newspapers speak by the book or not. The Prime Minister has stated that he must not be held responsible for the utterances of his party newspapers. But, when a paper like the 'Le Soleil' will announce itself as follows:

We declare, once for all, that 'Le Soleil' is the organ of the Liberal party, and by that fact is under the direction and absolute control of Sir Wilfrid. The supporters of Sir Wilfrid, and those who affirm themselves to be such, are begged to take notice of the present declaration.

I say when the 'Le Soleil' so announces itself, surely the Prime Minister will not repudiate an organ that distinctly states that it is so subject to him as to be under his absolute direction and control. And, this is why Manitoba's boundaries have not been extended at the present juncture, according to this paper:

The school legislation of the little province is not of a nature to attract the immigrants who people the districts. The Northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them.

Every good act has its reward, every bad act its chastisement. Manitoba will remain lowest with her pretentious law.

Is this the true reason? Have we to go to the press of the right hon. gentleman for his true reasons in these matters? Is it not a humiliating position for any government to be placed in, when one of its own journals distinctly gives such a reason why Manitoba's boundaries have not been extended? But it is not only that one journal which has been speaking in this manner. There is another publication in the west, the 'Northwest Review,' which deals with the very same question in much the same spirit. Speaking a couple of weeks ago

about Mr. Rogers and the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' it says:

Two days after the 'Telegram' had trumpeter abroad the Hon. Robert Rogers' great hopes for the western extension of Manitoba, the same wise and prophetic journal deplores the fact that there will be no such extension in any direction.

Then this newspaper goes on to say:

But it omits to give the reason thereof. The only obstacle to the territorial expansion of our province is its iniquitous and cruel school system. Not even the wildest corner of any unorganized territory will consent to saddle itself with such a tyranny. Manitoba must be content to remain small and mean so long as it maintains its small and mean school policy.

Is that the kind of policy we have in that province? If it is, who is responsible? Who but the right hon. gentleman's own colleague, the ex-premier of Manitoba (Mr. Greenway) now the hon. member for Lisgar. It was Mr. Greenway's government which passed the school law, and the hon. gentleman, ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is one of our public men who was mainly responsible for the passage of that law. These gentlemen will hardly agree that it is a mean and a cruel school policy. If there is any blame to be attached to the people of the province by reason of this school policy, the hon. gentleman's own friends are responsible and he himself is accessory to the fact. He supported the instigators and the supporters of that policy every time they appealed to the people of Manitoba both before and since this Manitoba school law was passed. He gave them every assistance in his power to gain their re-election, and he has been heralded everywhere as the great conciliator, the gentleman who settled the school question to the satisfaction of everybody. But his own journals evidently are not satisfied. They say that it has not been settled to the satisfaction of the minority, and that on that account the boundaries of Manitoba will not be extended. Because that province happens to be ruled at present by a Conservative government and because that government will not alter the school policy to suit the wishes of supporters of the right hon. gentleman, we are to be denied our just request for an extension of our boundaries. I bring this matter to the attention of the House because the right hon. gentleman may not be aware of the extent to which the discussion of this question is carried in the journals of the west. I have even seen that reason given circulation in the Toronto 'Star.' Well, if we are to be treated in this way, we ought to know it. The right hon. gentleman has never yet given this House any reason why the request of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries should not be granted except the puerile one that he