

'I have just arrived at Rome once more at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the government and parliament of Canada. My instructions enjoin me to again renew to Your Eminence the desire which I had already the honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to nominate a permanent delegate to Canada as representative of His Holiness who would reside on the spot but would be outside all local interests.'

So that by this plain arrangement a delegate was appointed who was regarded as necessary on account of differences of opinion which existed at that time between Sir Wilfrid and certain of his following as to his official signed statement declaring he was a party to the final settlement of the Manitoba school question. Here again, we have the hand of Sir Wilfrid engaged in double-dealing in this matter as is evidenced by his assurance to Cardinal Rampolla through Mr. Russell, the Canadian legal representative, who wrote to His Eminence as follows, presenting Sir Wilfrid's side of the case at Rome:

We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in His wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice.

Now, this to my mind is conclusive that Sir Wilfrid in combination with Monseigneur Sbarretti had hoped by their present course to carry out the promise given through their accredited representative, Mr. Charles Russell, in this underhand way. In view of the foregoing, I am sure that Sir Wilfrid Laurier owes it to the people of this province to at once give a reason why we are not entitled to immediate consideration and action other than the flimsy excuse which he has already himself created in his invitation to Mr. Whitney to advance a claim to some portion of Keewatin which did not form part of old Canada.

It is certainly idle for any person to assume that Monseigneur Sbarretti, occupying the position he does, would press me to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he did without the full knowledge and consent of Sir Wilfrid and his colleagues. And on the other hand Sir Wilfrid's attitude carries with it evidence of a full knowledge of arrangement, as is evident by his creation of excuses for delay as well as his failure to give reason or cause for same, and further by his unfairness in bringing down one side of the case and attempting to secure a prejudgment from the people without their having Manitoba's reply to his minute of council of March 21, which was received by this government on March 28 and replied to on March 31.

Can you give us your reply for publication? Mr. Rogers was asked.

No, because it can only be made public through the usual channel, that of being laid on the table of the House and Sir Wilfrid is at perfect liberty and should do this at once.

Before I proceed any further, I may say at once, referring to the whole tenor of this document, that in so far as there is a charge that there was an understanding between Monseigneur Sbarretti and myself to have the school question considered in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, there is not a shadow nor a tittle of truth in it. Mr. Rogers uses this language:

It is certainly idle for any person to assume that Monseigneur Sbarretti, occupying the position he does, would presume to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he did without the full knowledge and consent of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues.

I assert that if Mr. Rogers states that Monseigneur Sbarretti did press him to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he says Monseigneur Sbarretti did with my knowledge, he states something which is not in accordance with truth. If that has taken place it has taken place wholly without my knowledge and without my participation, and I never heard of it in any way whatever until last Saturday, when the matter was brought to my notice by a telegram from the Toronto 'Globe.' Then Mr. Rogers goes on to say:

And, on the other hand, Sir Wilfrid's attitude carries with it evidence of a full knowledge of arrangement, as is evident by his creation of excuses for delay, as well as his failure to give reason or cause for same and further by his unfairness in bringing down one side of the case and attempting to secure a prejudgment from the people without their having Manitoba's reply to his minute of council of March 21, which was received by this government on March 28, and replied to on March 31.

On Monday last, which was the 3rd of April, I brought down to this House a return to an address moved for some time ago by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), asking for copies of all correspondence that had taken place between the government of Manitoba and this government on the subject of the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The last paper upon this return was the acknowledgment of the receipt of our reply to the prayer of the Manitoba government. We have received since that time a further rejoinder by Manitoba to our reply. We did not bring it down on Monday with the return, because we had not then received it. It arrived at the Privy Council office only yesterday. I at once gave orders to the clerk of the Privy Council to have it prepared for presentation to the House and I have to-day laid it on the table of the House. In all this there was no evidence of any intention to conceal anything. There was nothing to conceal, this was a public document. Then I see by the correspondence that the order of the Manitoba government was passed on the 31st of March, which was last Friday. It was sent to us on the following day, Saturday. It could not therefore get here until yesterday morning, and as soon as it was received by us, as I said a moment ago, I gave instructions to have it prepared and laid on the table of the House, so as to form part of the correspondence which the people of this country have a right to have before them. Now, I pass to another statement of Mr. Rogers: