

that mean anything like what has been suggested? If you extract one or two phrases from it you can make it mean anything you like. But, take the article in its entirety. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition quoted from the 'Northwest Review' and sought to make the government responsible for its utterances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I expressly said that it had no connection with the government as far as I understand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend says it has no connection. Then, I will go a step further. I am sorry to say it has considerable connection in the way of criticism. I think it has been the most violent opponent that the government has had. I would refer my hon. friend to the articles published in 1896 by the 'Northwest Review' in which they criticised my right hon. friend the leader of the government more severely than any other paper in the country. They even went to the length of comparing him in effect with Judas Iscariot among the other vagaries which they indulged in. This is an organ for which this government cannot be held responsible. I do not think it is necessary for me to go very much further. But, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) this afternoon said, in speaking of this interview that took place down at the delegate's house, that both parties to the interview agreed to take the public into their confidence. Nothing could be further from what I conceive to be the fact. The parties to the conference, as far as I can judge of what occurred, both respected the obligation that is binding upon gentlemen. The delegate is a gentleman and I presume that this applies with equal truth to Mr. Campbell. I am sure that he is a gentleman but the man who violated the confidence of these gentlemen is Mr. Rogers. This is the man who takes it upon himself to tell us what took place out of his presence and without his personal knowledge. How is it that Mr. Campbell has not corroborated this interview? The delegate has made the statement only because this document has been published, only because his confidence has been violated. That is the only reason. The delegate has not taken anybody into his confidence. I appeal to the hon. leader of the opposition to tell me whether or not he thinks that this conference having taken place under these circumstances, Mr. Rogers was justified in violating it. That is what strikes me at the outset. How is it Mr. Rogers makes this declaration? Why did Mr. Campbell not make it if he had any declaration to make? If it were necessary for somebody outside of Mr. Campbell to make this statement why did Mr. Roblin not make it? Why did Mr. Roblin, the head of the government, not issue this manifesto? Does his silence

suggest anything? Perhaps before this controversy ends we will hear from Mr. Roblin and we will understand why it is that he has not made this statement, that he has not issued this manifesto.

Now, I will not detain the House any longer. But, perhaps I might draw the attention of the House to the interview with the delegate. I might say that in so far as I am concerned, and I am speaking entirely for myself, I have no desire to see the delegate leave this country. He never will leave it in so far as I am concerned if I can prevent it. There shall be, there can be no misunderstanding about my position. He has brought about peace in the province of Quebec, that peace has been maintained since 1896 and I trust that he shall continue to be with us so that peace may continue to remain with us. What is it that he has done in this matter? What is he to be criticised for? Some hon. gentlemen have told us that he was in Manitoba last year. He there met Mr. Campbell. He does not say what occurred between them. He is a gentleman. Then he tells us that hearing that Mr. Campbell was here on the 23rd February, a few days after this Autonomy Bill was introduced into this House, he asked him to come down and meet him and there he discussed with him this question of the condition of the Catholics of Manitoba. I want to say here and now that in so far as I am concerned the delegate was perfectly within his rights when he discussed this matter, that the delegate was perfectly within his rights when he endeavoured to obtain from this gentleman the redress of this grievance that has continued for a long time. When Mr. Campbell got down there what occurred between them? The delegate pointed out again to him the condition of the Roman Catholics in Manitoba and said to him: Cannot you alleviate in some way the grievance under which these people labour? Can you not in effect extend to the larger towns, such as Brandon and Winnipeg, the same privileges that you have extended to the Roman Catholic population in the country districts; that is simply extending the law in operation in Manitoba in such a way as to enable it to be availed of in cities and towns. Mr. Campbell does not appear to have repudiated the suggestion. He accepted it. Then, the delegate said: You are endeavouring to have your boundaries extended. This was a matter of common notoriety, it was a matter of common notoriety that the inhabitants of the district which would be affected were opposed to any extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and he said that the first step to be adopted in the direction of obtaining what was desired was to conciliate the interest of the people in the Territories to be affected.

Mr. LAKE. In the district of Keewatin?