

sending for copies of these Bills for the purpose of informing himself of their contents. We know, too, that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), generally conceded to stand next to the First Minister himself, was not consulted. Well, what about the other members of the government? Doubtless we have constitutional principle that a Bill presented to the House by a member of the administration, and particularly by the leader of the government, is held to embody the united wisdom of the government, in regard to the measure dealt with. But in this case we have some evidence as to the facts, and with the exception of the statement made a few days ago, during the course of this debate, by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and, I think, by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), to the effect that they had some acquaintance with the provisions of this measure at or about the time it was introduced, the evidence appears to point to the conclusion that the other members of the government were not consulted; at all events, in regard to clause 16, commonly known as the educational clause. On this educational clause Mr. Haultain was denied consultation. He, beyond question, was the legally and properly constituted representative of the people of the west, whose status for all time was being fixed and disposed of. There is no evidence that the members from the Northwest supporting the government were consulted. As regards the educational provisions of this Bill as originally introduced, the evidence appears to be the other way, because we know that the government occupied a period of about a month continuously in consultation ostensibly with these hon. gentlemen upon the one hand as we now know, with the Papal ablegate upon the other, with this singular result that the right hon. leader of the government did not recede one inch in principle, but in matters of detail he went even farther than did the Bill as originally introduced. I say he went farther, because the body of the amended clause 16 makes no pretense of concealing a direct amendment of the British North America Act. It will not be denied that this is a most important step in the political life of the Northwest. It is an occasion when no shadow of a pretense should be left for the suggestion that the people whose interests more directly were being dealt with were not most exhaustively consulted. Mr. Haultain should be left no peg upon which to hang an assertion of want of the fullest confidence in him as the duly accredited representative of the people of this region. He was, indeed, specially in attendance for the purpose of consultation. Instead of this we have Mr. Haultain's statement and that statement is that, with regard to these educational clauses, with the exception of a casual reference to them on the Friday preceding the Tuesday on which they were

presented to the House, and another at twelve o'clock of the day on which, at three o'clock they were presented, there was no consultation with him whatever. Mr. Haultain's letter to the right hon. Prime Minister published in the press stands as the record, so far as he is concerned; and we know that the people of the Northwest themselves have protested against this measure, by public meetings, through their press, by representations made to their members in this parliament, and otherwise. In fact, Sir, it would seem that the right hon. Prime Minister has, throughout this transaction, acted the part of an autocrat and a czar. Instead of crowning the political status of the Northwest with complete and absolute autonomy, the right hon. gentleman, it seems to me, proceeds by his Bill, as I propose, in part to show, to dim the lustre of that crown by plucking from it those bright particular stars with which it should be adorned. It will not be denied, that on this occasion, it would have been eminently proper, in framing these Acts to have regarded the whole Northwest including Manitoba, when redividing that great region into new jurisdictions. Manitoba's boundaries should have been extended westerly and northerly. Its area is ridiculously small as compared with its sisters in confederation. Manitoba, for many years, was charged with the serious burden of administering these enormous territories, and was also burdened with the introduction of law and order, in fact of civilization, into that great lone land. In a word, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba was the experiment by which was proved, and by which has been most abundantly proved, the enormous, the absolutely limitless possibilities of the whole west. Its just claims should undoubtedly have been considered. It should not have been left cribbed, cabined and confined as it is and as has been fitly said, as a mere postage stamp upon the map of the Dominion. It appears to me from the frame of the Bills and the amendment proposed by the government to clause 16, and the general history of their introduction into this parliament, and also from the tenor of this debate, that the primary object of the government in imbedding these Bills, was to fasten about the necks of the new provinces a system of separate schools for all time. And I think it has always been a just inference from the facts within our knowledge that the reason, or at least, a reason, for the refusal of the government to extend the boundaries of Manitoba westerly, was that to the extent of such extension, the object of the government would be defeated. It may be said, Sir, that complete and absolute autonomy granted to a territory on its erection into a province, means at least, no restrictions upon its full constitutional rights and powers as