

province of Quebec have in connection with the division of Keewatin? Or even the province of Ontario, for that matter? Why both of these have had large additions to their territories since Manitoba was made a province and Manitoba was not consulted? There is the less cause for consulting them, when we take into consideration the fact that the district of Keewatin has been under the jurisdiction of Manitoba the past thirty years. The administration of justice in that district has all taken place under the jurisdiction of the lieutenant governor of Manitoba, and the province of Manitoba can be extended to the Hudson bay without encroaching on one foot of territory properly belonging to Ontario or Quebec. In my opinion therefore the refusal of the request of Manitoba was entirely unjust and will meet with the condemnation of every citizen of that province irrespective of party. This has not been a party question. Hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House from the province of Manitoba have brought it up in the Manitoba legislature. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have brought it up, and it has been treated as a non-party question. It is also being treated in that light by the press of both political parties. It has even received the endorsement of the mouthpiece of the Liberal party in the east, the *Toronto 'Globe.'* And in view of this general expression of approval, it seems to me that the province of Manitoba has been treated in a most cavalier and unjust manner.

I was somewhat surprised to find that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in that lengthy speech which he addressed to this House, representing as he does a Manitoba constituency, did not think this question of sufficient importance to even give it a passing notice. He was a member of the government no doubt, when this and similar requests were made in the past. He was, in Ottawa when the delegation from that province came here to press its claim. He was also in the city when the delegation from the board of trade of the city of Winnipeg came down and pressed the claim of that province. Still he has never uttered a protest against the action of this government in turning down the reasonable request of Manitoba for an extension of its territory.

Laying aside the question of the extension of Manitoba's boundaries, there are two features in this Bill which deserve special condemnation by the people of the province of Manitoba. I refer to the educational clauses and the land clauses. Why do I say they should meet with the condemnation of the province of Manitoba? Because we, in that province, have had our bitter experience in connection with each of those questions. Up to the present Manitoba is the only province in confederation which has been denied the ownership of its public lands, and because of that fact,

our legislators have had to come down to the central government on numerous occasions, hat in hand, asking an addition to their public revenues in order to be able to cope with the requirements of that developing province. There would have been no need for these begging trips had that province been dealt with justly and fairly as were the other provinces, and we take a sufficient interest in the newly created provinces in the west to desire that they should not have a similar experience and that they should profit by our example. Therefore we urge on the government the claims of our sister provinces.

In my opinion also no financial consideration, which even at present may appear most liberal in its character—eulogized as liberal by hon. gentlemen opposite—will sufficiently compensate for the withholding from those new provinces of their public domain. Without their lands, those provinces will have not one single asset independent of this government, save the power of taxing themselves. To obtain a precedent for this treatment, the right hon. gentleman had to go to the American republic. How frequently have we not heard that right hon. gentleman in eloquent tones declaim against our borrowing examples from American politicians! But, he did not go to the American republic when he desired to get a precedent in connection with the school policy. On the contrary he went out of his way to offer a gratuitous insult to the Americans who are flocking into our Northwest by thousands, when he compared their comparatively inferior moral stamina with ours and attributed it largely to their public school system and to the exclusion from that system of the teaching of certain religious dogma. He always goes, he tells us, for his great examples to the motherland, but in this instance he did not. Had he gone to the motherland for a precedent in the settlement of the land question, he would have had a precedent entirely contradictory to the policy he has followed. He would have found that imperial statesmen in days gone by took the same position as the one he takes now regarding the ownership of those lands. He would have found that they urged that those lands should be held by the empire for the benefit of the people of the empire. But better counsels prevailed, and it was recognized that these lands could not be administered to the same advantage from Downing street as in Canada itself. What the imperial government has done for this Dominion the Dominion government should have done for the provinces and handed over to them their lands to administer in the interest of their own people. Justice, Sir, is far more essential—very often at any rate—than any mere financial consideration; and I much mistake the character and temper of our western people if they do not condemn the government's policy in reference to these