

invitation which went on the 20th of the month was in order to have the benefit of that conference before the information was given in this House and in order that the First Minister could take advantage of it. Was it not likely? It seems the most likely thing in the world. That conference was held, the Manitoba delegates did not accept the invitation and respond to it as desired, by agreeing to grant separate schools, and what was the result? The next day when the announcement was made they were told through the Prime Minister's speech in the House that their boundaries could not be extended. No reason was assigned except that other provinces might be interested. Practically no reason whatever was assigned for it, but they have that simple information. Robert Rogers says they were to get information in a few days. Afterwards Mr. Rogers writes a letter asking whether the information was not forthcoming. The Prime Minister says he never received the letter but we have had evidence in this House that that letter was sent direct to the Prime Minister's own house. That was established by indisputable evidence. There was no doubt about that. Whether it ever went into the Prime Minister's hands I do not know, but it went to his house.

Mr. BELCOURT. He has denied that.

Mr. SPROULE. That it was sent to his house?

Mr. BELCOURT. He denied that.

Mr. SPROULE. Allow me to say he did not.

Mr. BELCOURT. He did.

Mr. SPROULE. He says if it ever came to his house it was not put into his hands.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well.

Mr. SPROULE. That is all he says and we have the evidence of the party that carried it. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is a lawyer and is too previous and ought to be correct in his facts before he starts to contradict.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend—

Mr. SPROULE. I am dealing with the statement of the First Minister, a more important man. Allow me to finish with him. I say that the First Minister said: That letter may have reached my house, but it never came into my hands.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is a different statement.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an admission of another plain fact; there is no doubt of it whatever. The statements are admitted as facts and are established by irrefutable evidence in my judgment.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. CALDWELL. Might I ask a question of the hon. gentleman? May I ask him if he is sure that that letter which he is saying was delivered was the letter which he meant?

Mr. SPROULE. The letter was handed to a messenger brought into the room for that purpose by the member who was charged with it. His word should be worth something in this House. That messenger gives his word that he delivered the letter. Is he making out that that messenger was a liar or the member? Which?

Mr. CALDWELL. You do not understand my question.

Mr. SPROULE. I have answered the question.

Mr. CALDWELL. I am asking a question, are you sure that the letter delivered was the one that you referred to?

Mr. SPROULE. Did the messenger get any other letter? Is he aware of any other letter which he got? The messenger says he delivered it. The letter was handed to him by a member of parliament who says that this letter was the one written by Robert Rogers. Is that direct enough? I might very properly ask whether the minister got a letter at all that day; I might ask a dozen questions from some messenger, I am taking the evidence that has been submitted to this House, but that I think, is reliable and should be accepted. Part of it is the evidence of an hon. minister of the Crown, part of it is that of an hon. member of parliament and the other portion of it is furnished by a messenger whom we believe to be telling the truth and by the record of the book which shows that the message was taken. What was the subject discussed? The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba; the school question. The Papal delegate admits that the suggestion was made that it will facilitate business if you will make these two amendments to the school law. That is what Mr. Rogers says; that is what the Papal ablegate admits. And then the ablegate admits that the proposed clauses of the Act read substantially as he gave them. Put the story all together and what is it? It exactly confirms the statement made in the main by the Hon. Mr. Rogers. Now, the Papal ablegate has a connection with the Autonomy Bill, he has a conference and his success in fastening separate schools upon two provinces naturally create a desire to go a little further and see if he could not extend that system to Manitoba. That is the most reasonable thing in the world. Why would he not do it? He ventured to do it. What does this mean if it does not mean that there is interference with the duties of the state by somebody? Who is that somebody? The representatives of