

so that the argument based upon that point was scarcely worth the time it took to state it. It was within the right of the Manitoba government to choose their own time and the time chosen was that of the approaching creation of provinces in the west. Then they pressed their claim and I say that was an opportune time. The right hon. gentleman tried to make something out of the fact that he stated his policy with reference to the extension of Manitoba's boundaries on February 21st, and that therefore there was no reason at all for any person no matter what his position to attempt to gain influence for any purpose over the Manitoba government by holding out to them the idea that their territories might be enlarged. I take issue with my right hon. friend in that respect. He did not state in detail the policy of the Dominion government with reference to the extension of those Territories. He simply stated that they did not propose to extend those Territories until after conference with other provinces, and that steps would be taken at once or as soon as convenient to call the representatives of the different provinces that might be interested to come together and to talk this matter over. It would have been possible to extend the Manitoba boundaries to the northwest, to the north or to the northeast at any time; these districts were all perfectly open and they lay there with all their possibilities. Let us come to one other point, to the very small point that was taken to-day that Monseigneur Sbarretti did not see Mr. Rogers, he did not know Mr. Rogers, he had no conversation with Mr. Rogers, and that therefore the whole argument was against Mr. Rogers. My right hon. friend must have taken leave of his senses. Was the Hon. Colin Campbell down here on a private pleasure trip? Was he down here as a private citizen? He was down here with his colleague Mr. Rogers as a delegation of the Manitoba government backed by the resolutions of their legislature as official as any commission could be made. They were here on an official visit and for an official occasion and it does not matter a single bit as to whether this conference was had with Mr. Rogers or Mr. Campbell.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Or with the two of them together.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; order.

Mr. FOSTER. It was with an accredited representative of the Manitoba government. But oh, says my right hon. friend—and this is his final argument—this was a private conference. It was not a public conference. In what way would a conference take place? Would it be supposed that Monseigneur Sbarretti would put an advertisement in the newspapers, would send a bellman about the streets to tell everybody that at a certain hour he was going to meet the representa-

tives of the Manitoba government to talk over certain matters of policy? Would he do that? In what way could any conference take place between these gentlemen that would not necessarily be a private conference? But it was not private in this sense that both of the contracting parties have thought that it was their right and their duty to take the public into their confidence and to tell them what transpired at that conference. So there does not appear to be much in that argument.

There were certain things that my right hon. friend however did not deny and they are quite as remarkable as the things that he did deny. He has been told times without number to his face in this House and he has not once risen to deny it, it has been very courteously brought to his attention to-day and he has thoroughly ignored it, that before he brought down his educational clause on February 21, 1905, there had been numerous conferences between himself and Monseigneur Sbarretti with reference to the provisions of that Bill. Will the premier deny it now? He does not. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, I ask this House, I ask the people of this country if it has come to this that in Canada the representative of any church I do not care what it is—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Through its accredited highest head—must be visited by the premier of this country before he dares to bring down the policy to be adopted for the Northwest provinces?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman has not denied it yet. Then I wish to ask one other question to aid this thoughtfulness that I am sure is pervading the country at the present moment. Is it proper for the right hon. gentleman as leader of a government to have frequent conferences with the Papal ablegate in Ottawa with reference to a dominant part of his policy in creating new provinces and to give the go-by to the representatives of the people of the government?

Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman did not consult the Minister of the Interior who represented the Northwest Territories, who was their sole representative in the cabinet in reference to the educational clauses of the Bill, but he sits in abject silence and allows me to state here in the House endorsed by that silence that he did care to consult the Papal delegate here in Ottawa. The right hon. leader of the government did not consult the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Will the right hon. gentleman tell me now whether he consulted on that educational clause more frequently the one than the other, his Postmaster General or the Papal ablegate? Why all this trouble and talk in the country because Monseigneur Sbarretti goes to the