

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No the district adjoining Manitoba on the west.

Mr. LAKE. I thought that question was settled.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was settled before this interview. That is exactly what we contend for. The delegate evidently did not know anything about what had taken place. It was settled two days before that conference. He said that if you want your boundaries extended the best thing you can do is to conciliate the inhabitants of the country to be affected because the government cannot agree and will not agree in all probability to extend the boundaries of Manitoba against the wishes of the people whose political interests depend upon the change and whose political interests would be affected by the change. And he said to him: Here, these people, the Roman Catholics, are in the enjoyment of separate schools, whereas if they come into the province of Manitoba they will be under a different constitution and they will object to any extension of the boundaries of Manitoba which will prejudicially affect their interests in so far as the school question is concerned. Is there anything improper in that? Is there anything wrong? Is there anything that the delegate should apologize for? Incidentally let me observe that we have heard a great deal about the nefarious system of separate schools in the Northwest. We have heard a great deal about the shackles that we are going to put on the hands of the people there, it has been said that we are going to submit the people of the Territories to an indignity by imposing upon them a separate school system and yet here we find that these people, instead of desiring to throw off the shackles, unanimously protest against any change. This is simply an incidental remark that I want to make at the present moment. But, I shall not transgress the rules of the House. Unfortunately, some time before we reach the third reading of the Bill, I shall be obliged to inflict a speech upon the House. But, is there anything improper in what has taken place which makes it necessary to speak of the delegate in the ill disguised terms of contempt which have been applied to him by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House? Why should he be called a policeman, or likened to a cabman? Is there any necessity for that? Is there anything in what has occurred to justify these epithets that were applied to him? Now, the delegate goes on, and see what he says about his conversations so far as the government is concerned. He says:

The federal government had absolutely no knowledge of it.

That is to say; had absolutely no knowledge of his interview with Mr. Campbell. And, as had been suggested by my friend

Mr. LAKE.

beside me here, sometimes people think that I have more to do with these things than I actually have, but I can tell you that I never knew of that interview until yesterday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will add this: if the ablegate had consulted me about it probably this interview would never have occurred—I saw these two gentlemen when they were here with Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The delegate goes on to say:—

It was a private conversation and simply intended to express the suggestion and the desire that the condition of the Catholics in the respect I have mentioned would be improved.

What was there wrong about that; what was there improper about that? What is there in that of which the government need be ashamed; what is there in that for which the government can be held responsible? The delegate says he had a private conversation with this gentleman, that his object was simply to improve the condition of the Catholics, and he says the government had no knowledge of it. Why should we be held responsible for that. If I were not a member of the government and had not certain responsibility as such, I would say immediately right now, that I would be prepared to take all responsibility for everything the delegate said. I see nothing in it that any man need be ashamed of and I speak now, not as a Catholic, but as a citizen of this country. I have made a longer speech than I intended and I apologize to the House for so doing, but I thought it was my duty to make this statement, and I trust that in doing so I have not been apologetic for a course which I think was perfectly legitimate and proper.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I do not understand why the Minister of Justice has brought my name into this discussion. He referred to my being in company this afternoon with the Hon. Mr. Leblanc, a member of the Quebec legislature and ex-speaker of that body, who happened to be here and who was kindly offered a seat on the floor of the House. And the Minister of Justice availed of this incident to introduce my name into the beginning of his speech, and to say that we wanted to make an attack upon His Excellency. The Minister of Justice also said that the leader of the opposition had thought it well to make an apology for the remarks he made this afternoon, but I do not know that the leader of the opposition made any apology, and I do not understand that he had any to make. The question which the leader of the opposition brought before the House, is a most important one, and in what I shall say now I will be as candid as the Minister of Jus-