

Prairie aided him, abetted him, encouraged him, spoke for that policy, canvassed on it and possibly may have got some votes on the strength of that appeal. In the face of this declaration of last March, I ask the hon. gentleman if he then considered such a system was not worthy of consideration. If so, how humiliating a position he must occupy to-day—or is he of the lightning change variety, can he change his policy to suit the exigencies of the day?

Now, so much for government ownership. I am pleased also to see that at long last the province of Manitoba is promised at least a measure of justice in connection with the extension of its boundaries. But we have heard so many diverse reports as to the character of the proposed extension that we await with considerable interest the production of this Bill. I view with a certain amount of apprehension the concluding words of the sentence referring to this particular subject in the speech from the Throne. It says :

Among the measures to be submitted to you is a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and of other provinces.

What other provinces have to do in connection with the extension of Manitoba's boundaries, passes my comprehension. 'Tis true, the Prime Minister invited the governments of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan to come down here in conference and discuss the disposition of the district of Keewatin. I take it that the question of the boundaries of Manitoba is one between this government and the government of Manitoba alone; and speaking as a Manitoban, I emphasize that opinion by reason of this fact, that when the last boundaries of the province of Ontario were affected it was distinctly stated that those boundaries were to be for all time to come. In connection with Saskatchewan, just the year before, this government had given them 250,000 square miles of territory, and why that province should be called in to decide as to the disposition of the district of Keewatin, I cannot comprehend. The member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) who seems to be more loquacious out of the House than he is in it, has already given two diverse reports as to the character of this proposed extension. The member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has referred to it. During the by-election in the constituency of Mountain, in the province of Manitoba, that gentleman took the platform and told the people there that amongst the Liberals themselves they had decided on the proper boundaries of the province of Manitoba, and that the northern boundary was to be the Churchill river, Saskatchewan and Manitoba to have equal access to the bay by way of the Churchill river, and a measure was to be introduced to that effect. The session went on and no Bill was introduced. During the last provincial election Mr. Brown, the leader of the opposi-

tion, stated publicly that he had a pledge from this government that a Bill would be introduced last session for the extension of the boundaries of our province, and he would not be at all surprised if that Bill were introduced prior to the provincial elections. The elections were held, no Bill. The session was ended, no Bill introduced. We have had the hon. member for Selkirk, within the past month, breaking forth in songs again, and this time he is reported in the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' the Liberal organ, as having said that a Bill would be introduced this session for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, and that Bill would provide that the northern boundary would be the 60th parallel, making it harmonize with the northern boundaries of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Now the hon. gentleman cannot be right in both these versions, and which is accurate? I am somewhat sceptical of the hon. gentleman's right to speak with authority. We remember that the Prime Minister has seen fit to invite the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario to a conference to take into consideration the disposition of Keewatin. They came down, they placed their cases before the government, he stated their representations would be taken into consideration, and he would let them know the outcome. From that day to this, so far as my knowledge goes, the governments of those provinces have not been made aware of the decision of this government in that respect. If the statement of the hon. member for Selkirk is true, this is what happened. The hon. member for Selkirk, a private member of this House, who was not a member of that conference, has been taken into the confidence of a member of this government, to the neglect and slighting of the premiers of the other provinces who were invited here, and who are still ignorant of the proposed extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, or the proposed disposition of the district of Keewatin. However, I trust that when that report is brought down it will be found that the lands, the timber and the minerals there may be on those lands in that added territory, will be handed over to be owned by the province of Manitoba: if not, that Bill will not be satisfactory to the people of our province, in view of the experience we have had during the last few years.

Now, there is a paragraph which refers to two of the ministers having been sent as special plenipotentiaries to France to negotiate the French treaty. I am not referring to this for the purpose of discussing the treaty, but judging by the able exposition of it by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Thos. Chisholm) I am almost inclined to the opinion that it amounts to a license to sell absinthe, wines, spirits and liquors in Canada. Whatever the treaty may be, I am afraid, so long as that gentleman's speech goes uncontradicted, and the government have not answered any of his State-