

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is scarcely worth denying.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not a denial.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, out of courtesy to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), for whom I have a certain regard—there are gentlemen, of course, for whom I would not reply—I never saw those clauses till they were published—

Mr. SPROULE. And never knew anything about them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Never knew anything about them, directly or indirectly, nor of the interview, until yesterday.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, the Minister of Justice has made a statement which I accept with pleasure, as I always do any statement he makes in this House. I only gave him the opportunity, in view of the statement made in the press over and over again concerning him. Very frequently, when a direct statement is made concerning any important politician, that politician takes the earliest moment to deny it. I only gave the hon. minister that opportunity—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will bear witness that I am not very lavish with my denials. I do not, as a rule, pay much attention to statements of that sort.

Mr. SPROULE. I speak only of the general practise among politicians. As the Minister of Justice has denied it, I have nothing more to say. But was it not natural that the delegate from Manitoba should come to the conclusion that the government's hand was behind it? Was it the fine Italian hand alone that accounted for it? How did he know our statutes so as to be able to draw clauses that would dove-tail into them and accomplish what was wanted in Manitoba? Was there not some power behind him that prepared these subsections for him? There must have been. And certainly it would not have been any one in the Manitoba government, for they did not accept it. Now, it is admitted and not denied that the Papal ablegate took an important part in preparing these Autonomy Bills to establish the two new provinces, in drawing up their educational clauses. It is admitted that conferences took place, that he was satisfied and accepted them. Now, if separate schools are fastened on half a continent there, who has done it? The government through the representative of the church. He helped them to do it. And if he was successful in establishing them over 500,000 square miles of territory, is it any wonder that he attempted to go farther and fasten them on Manitoba as well?

When he had succeeded so well with the government of the day with his diplomacy and with the craft which belongs

to men of his position in getting the state to accept that, is it any wonder that he tried to go a little farther and attempted to add to his name something else that would embellish him in the history of fame if he could only compel Manitoba to give these separate schools. Why it is the most natural thing in the world. He had the same men to deal with, he had been successful with them once and he hoped to be successful with them again. He ventured a little farther and he entered into communication with the delegates of Manitoba who came down here in a case of emergency in their strong desire to have justice done to their province, and he takes advantage of their necessity and of their dire necessity to play the game a little further. He endeavoured to secure from them the establishment of separate schools in Manitoba. Is this not another case of church interference with the rights of the state? That was a state matter, that was a government policy and a function of the state and this was an interference with it. It is not denied, it is practically accepted by the present government and yet the First Minister says we will fight it out along these lines to the end. I will tell him to keep on with that fight and to congratulate himself on the result when he comes to the end of it. It is claimed and not denied that this proposal in the Bill was submitted and it was carried through. There is no doubt on that subject. Now, we combine the statement of the Papal ablegate and the Dominion government with regard to the statement of the Hon. Robert Rogers. Three of the five specific items mentioned by Rogers which are known to the government are admitted to be correct. As to the fourth one a lapse of memory is pleaded; the First Minister says: I have no remembrance of it and I think I would remember it if it was so—but he does not say it was not so. On the fifth one the government denies that they had any knowledge of what took place when the Manitoba delegates were with the Papal ablegate. Rogers never said they knew what took place but he assumed they did in consequence of the circumstances that surrounded it, and I say he was justified in that conclusion. Then we take the Papal ablegate's admission that he invited them; as Rogers said an invitation came. When did it come? Mr. Rogers says March 20, the Papal ablegate says: I think I met them on the 23rd or the 24th before they left for home. The invitation seems to have been on the 20th of March. When was the Bill to be introduced in the House to give separate schools to the two new provinces? On the 21st of the month. When was the first disclosure to be given to the people whether or not their boundaries were to be extended? On the 21st. Is it not natural to reach the conclusion that that