

province. The only quarrel that exists, and that can exist, is between Sir Wilfrid Laurier as head of the government at Ottawa and the citizens of Manitoba.

We waited at Ottawa a number of days expecting to hear from Sir Wilfrid Laurier again, as promised, but nothing came, and we decided to write him the following letter:

Russell House, Ottawa, Feb. 23, 1905.

Sir,—As we find it necessary to leave Ottawa tomorrow, we desire to refer to our interview of Friday, the 17th, respecting Manitoba's claim for extension of her boundaries westward and northward, when you were good enough to suggest that if we would come here for two or three days you would be in a position to give us an answer respecting same. Up to the present, however, we have heard nothing further from you, excepting your statement in parliament on Tuesday last, when introducing your Autonomy bills, which we presume represents your fixed and final decision as to westward boundary.

In view of Manitoba's very strong claims, as presented to you in the memorial unanimously passed by our legislature, and supported and supplemented in our interview, we must enter, on behalf of the province, our firm protest against your decision in refusing to grant the prayer of our request, extension of our boundaries westward, and exceedingly regret that apparently local considerations have deprived Manitoba of what she rightfully regards as a most just claim.

Respecting extension northward, we most respectfully urge it on you that this should engage your consideration and attention during the present session.

We, of course, most emphatically deny the right of Quebec and Ontario having further to say in respect to the extension of our boundaries north to James Bay, or that they could advance any claim worthy of consideration that would necessitate delay in attaching this territory immediately to Manitoba.

We regard this as exclusively a matter for settlement between your government and Manitoba. We sincerely trust that upon further consideration you may see your way clear to grant the request we make on behalf of a united province.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) R. ROGERS.

We then waited a reasonable time, but no answer came, and we returned home. I then felt it my duty, on behalf of the people of Manitoba to make the statement of facts which I then made. I have nothing to regret and nothing to take back. I simply made a plain statement of the facts, every one of which stands. I made the statement to the public press of this country, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding whatsoever as to my position

and no misunderstanding between myself and my friend the Free Press, I want to say here and now that I wish to be understood as having repeated from my place in this house every single solitary charge which I made at that time as against Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

It is true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier undertook to dispute or controvert the statements I then made, and on which he and friends engaged the attention of the parliament of Canada for two days in undertaking to make a defence of his position. One of the principal points on which he dwelt so much was in fact that my statements must necessarily be all wrong in view of the fact that I made a specific statement that this legislature had passed a resolution year after year asking for an extension of our boundaries similar to that we were then asking for. Sir Wilfrid Laurier undertook to say from his place in the house that in this I was absolutely incorrect, for no request, or no resolution had been received by the parliament of Canada from 1896 down to the present hour. It was only necessary for me to ask Sir Wilfrid Laurier to turn to the journals of the parliament of Canada, over which he appears to have such absolute control, to clearly prove the incorrectness of his defence in this regard, as there he could find the resolution and request previously and unanimously made by this legislature. We were unanimous then in our demands, and I hope we are unanimous today.

The Same Conditions

The same conditions exist today, and I now challenge any individual in this country, or any organ representing Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Free Press included, to bring me face to face with one single, solitary syllable of my statements that are not absolutely correct, and in accordance with fact. If anything were necessary to substantiate my statements we had it in the various remarks which fell from hon. members in the parliament of Canada at that time when attempting to supply the defence for Sir Wilfrid Laurier's action. Alluding to that part of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's statement wherein he went on to say that he had pointed out during the interview with my friend the attorney-general and myself, that we should remember that in 1884 Sir John A. Macdonald had refused the extension of our boundaries, I want to say here now, and with all due respect to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that on this point, as on all others, his memory must indeed be failing him very much, for I am positive that the name of Sir John A. Macdonald was never mentioned during our interview, and certainly nothing respecting the refusal of a request for