

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman does not deny it. Are we then bound to assume, by his silence in answering my question, that they propose to bring that gentleman to the bar of the House? If that is a part of their policy, they had better bring Mr. Rogers too, because he has said a great many things in his manifesto which are very difficult to reconcile or to understand; and if there is to be any examination at the bar of the House as to what has transpired, it would be very nice to put some questions to Mr. Rogers. It would be very nice to ask him, in the first place, how he came to write that manifesto which anybody reading it would suppose to mean that he himself was the one who had the interview with the Papal ablegate. He speaks in the plural, the hon. gentleman says, and he was one of the deputation. And in the document also he speaks in the singular—he says 'I' rather a mixed document. Like to know where the singular ceases and the plural commences. Like to know why he thought it necessary to write such a document. His indignation, it would seem, was aroused against this Papal delegate for daring to suggest such a thing to him, but he had no opportunity, apparently, to express his indignation for six long weeks. And at last, when he had time to express his indignation, he carefully dug out from 'Hansard,' or somewhere else, correspondence that had taken place between certain parties years ago, when some members of this House professing the Roman Catholic faith had communication with the head of their church in reference to matters in which there was feeling in the province of Quebec in which these gentlemen resided. And these things are dragged in here. What for? Why to work upon the feelings and passions of those whom hon. gentlemen opposite hope to influence. But let me tell these hon. gentlemen one thing which, if they go on, I am sure they will find out for themselves. My province, which is also the province of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the province that I am proud to call my own, will not be led away by such unworthy cries as these.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to read the hon. gentleman a letter from a respectable constituent.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) might read me letters. And am I uncharitable in saying that the object of the hon. gentleman in bringing up subjects like these, taking up the time of the House and delaying the business of the country, is to keep alive the feeling that has been created? But that is the very reason why these hon. gentlemen must have their answer every time they bring these matters up. We must know whether their object is to uphold the grand principles of provincial rights and separation of church and state, or whether it is that the Tory party

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

may be restored to power by creating dissension among the people.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman Mr. Paterson) whether, when he occupied hours of the time of this House in denouncing the Manitoba school law he was raising a race and religious cry?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly not. The Liberal party does not do that. Certainly not. And we are challenged and told that if we go to the country we shall be defeated. Does the hon. gentleman know that all these events the correspondence concerning which has been dug up by Mr. Rogers occurred before the election of 1900, when the country sent the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) back to carry on public affairs? Is he aware that this matter was before the country, and all the documents in 'Hansard,' before 1904 when an appeal was made to the country, and when the Liberal party was again returned to power by a sweeping majority? There is only one object in this that I can see, and that is the vain hope that, now that there is some feeling—and I am bound to confess a good deal of feeling—in the country owing to the press, not alone the 'Toronto World,' but papers from whom better might have been expected—

An hon. MEMBER. What about the 'Globe'?

Mr. PATERSON. If the 'Globe' differs with the government in reference to the Autonomy Bill as they understand it, hon. gentlemen opposite can get an idea of the 'Globe's' opinion of Mr. Rogers if they read the editorial of to-day's issue. I have not the paper with me, but I think the Tories will find that the portrait of the man they have tried to magnify is not a flattering one as presented by the 'Globe.' I must not detain the House longer, having spoken at greater length than I had intended. But I make no apology. I have no desire to prolong the debate, and I want the business of the House to go on. For that reason, I have remained silent sometimes when I would have liked to speak. And so have other members on this side. But, if this is to be made the arena in which the battle of political parties are to be fought out on the basis of attempts on the part of Liberal-Conservatives, to arouse the passions and feelings of the country, I am prepared to take my part by speaking here when it becomes necessary. And the same is true of other hon. gentlemen on this side. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny the 'Hamilton Spectator' as one of their organs. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) dare not deny it. And what does the 'Hamilton Spectator' say. Here it is—black line at the top, and the heading 'Never again.' The article says:—

The attempt made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to force separate schools on the new provinces