

to vote against this legislation and against the present government. This agitation will not die out. No matter whether the elections come on in one year, or two years, or three years, or four years from now, this is a live question, and I venture to say that so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, even four years from now, this government will not carry half a dozen seats. I venture to predict that the same state of affairs will be found to exist in Manitoba and in those two new provinces. The present government will find that the free and independent electors will drive them out of power the first opportunity that presents itself.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

EXTRADITION CASES AT MONTREAL.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many extradition cases, demanded by the United States, have come, during the past eighteen months, before the extradition commissioner in the district of Montreal ?
2. What decision was given in each case ?
3. Before which commissioner or judge did the said extradition cases come, and by which were they decided upon ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Five extradition cases demanded by the United States have come, during the past eighteen months, before the Extradition Commissioners in the district of Montreal.

2. In four cases the prisoner was committed to await extradition ; one case (Gaynor and Greene) is still sub judice.

3. All before Mr. Commissioner Lafontaine.

GAYNOR-GREENE EXTRADITION.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the government aware that, during the extradition proceedings against John F. Gaynor and Benjamin D. Greene, a recusation for alleged reasons was taken against Mr. Ulric Lafontaine, the extradition commissioner ?

2. If so, what course does the government purpose taking in regard to the said recusation ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. It is a matter of public notoriety, through the newspapers, that in the extradition proceedings against John F. Gaynor and Benjamin D. Greene, a paper called a 'recusation' was filed against Mr. Lafontaine, the Extradition Commissioner ; but the government has no official notice of any such proceeding. The question of the magistrate's competency is now before the courts for judicial determination.

2. When the matter is officially before the government, it will be time to say what course the government propose taking in regard to it.

EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to say a few words with respect to a matter that was mentioned in the House yesterday. Let me, in the first place, speak of the letter of February 23rd, which evidently was not received by the Prime Minister. May I be permitted to say that I understood from the remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday that there was rather a reflection on Mr. Rogers in the suggestion that the letter had not been received. I rather gathered that the Prime Minister had some doubts as to whether or not the letter was written. Perhaps I misunderstood the right hon. gentleman, but it is, I think, right to say that very ample evidence was forthcoming of the writing and of the sending of the letter, and while we at once accept most unreservedly the statement of the Prime Minister that he did not receive it, still I would think that, under the circumstances, it would be a perfectly proper thing to include that letter in the correspondence which is about to be printed.

Since the discussion of yesterday a statement has been made by His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti. I will come to that a little later on. Let me say that I know nothing of the circumstances under which a delegate of the Holy See was in the first place brought to this country beyond what has been stated by gentlemen on the other side of the House, who are well qualified to make such statements, because they have personal knowledge of that which they state.

As I gather from them the Delegate Apostolic came to this country in 1897, not at the instance of the bishops of the Roman Catholic church in Canada, but at the instance of some forty Liberal members of parliament who are members of the Roman Catholic church. I understand that there was no demand for the appointment of a delegate by the bishops or clergy. In making that statement, of course, I rely entirely