

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A very strong point.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I think the inference is that way. The member for East Grey says that circumstantial evidence is very strong.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is where the letter was sent from, too.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, he says he rang the bell. Well, now, there has been a complete denial given by the First Minister as to his having any connection whatever with the interview that took place between these gentlemen. They should be more concerned to know what took place at that interview, what led up to it. Is there any truth in the rumours that were alluded to by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that negotiations have been going on between the members of the Tory government of Manitoba and the clerical dignitaries of the church in that country. Is that true or is it not? Are we to take their test again and say that because these gentlemen don't deny it, therefore it is true? Are we to deal with them as they attempted to deal with the First Minister and the Minister of Justice with regard to any rumours they hear?—and dear knows there are enough of them going about through the Tory papers nowadays—that because they don't deny the rumours therefore they are true. Where is the denial that the Manitoba government have been negotiating with the dignitaries of the church? Is it true or is it not? Sir, I judge from what we see in the newspapers that they will come out and tell us what has taken place in these negotiations with regard to the improvement of the condition of the children of the minority in the province of Manitoba, or at least what the minority consider would be an improvement. I cannot say more than what I see in the papers. Perhaps these hon. gentlemen may be able to get an answer from Mr. Rogers, or from Mr. Roblin, or from Mr. Campbell to know what has been done in that direction. But I want to say emphatically that if it is the object of the hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not see what other object they could have—to fan the flame of religious antagonism in this country, they are engaged in a work that is not creditable to any man who engages in it. I think the people will ask them whether the parliament of Canada is the proper place for members elected to represent all portions of this community to endeavour to excite one portion against another on matters that come very close to their hearts. Great love is professed by some of them for the Papal ablegate. Oh, how they admire him, how they respect him, and so on; then in another breath they call him a man who is conspiring against the liberties of the people. Take the 'World' of yesterday, the organ of my hon. friend opposite. Here I may say that if the leader of the opposition holds the Prime Minister responsible for

what appears in 'Le Soleil' and other papers all right, if that is to be the line, we will hold him responsible for what appears in the organs of his party.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The journal in question had declared itself to be under his particular charge and direction and to be the organ of the Liberal party, and it was admitted.

Mr. HYMAN. The 'Journal' said that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the 'Soleil.' I read an extract from the editorial utterance of the 'Soleil' of the 11th of February, and I also pointed out that, as we understood, the control of that paper was vested in a very important member of the present administration, the Minister of Justice.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I heard what the hon. gentleman said; and I leave it to your judgment, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House, whether that connects the Prime Minister with the 'Soleil' as closely as the Toronto 'World' is connected with the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. The editor of the 'World' is his supporter, to judge by his utterance, he is his right-hand man—if you leave the member for North Toronto out—in this House, and he will not deny it. He is not the one who was anxious to have the hon. gentleman to come to Carleton with the hope of getting a seat in the House, when unfortunately he was defeated in his own province; he is the man who rises and speaks for the party, the bosom friend of the leader of the opposition. Surely, surely, the paper of that hon. gentleman may be taken as indicating the views of the leader of the opposition, according to the reasoning of the leader of the opposition with regard to the 'Soleil.' What is one of the leading editorials in that paper to-day? Speaking of Monseigneur Sabatti—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad to be corrected, because it would be too bad to make a mistake with reference to his name, lest the wrong person should be summoned. But the organ of my hon. friend, known to be his organ because it is edited by one of his chief lieutenants, wants this reverend gentleman to be brought to the bar of the House. That is what they want to do with him. Now, then, I want to ask the leader of the opposition, does he propose—if we are to hold him responsible, according to his own reasoning, for what appears in the Toronto 'World'—does he propose to bring—I had better say the Papal ablegate—before the bar of the House? Is that the policy of the leader of the opposition and his party with reference to this matter?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the hon. gentleman's policy?