

gers says that the premier told him that an answer would be given in a few days. Well, the premier says, I have no remembrance of making such a statement, it is possible I may have done it, but I have a good memory and I have no remembrance of it. In the meantime an invitation comes from the Papal ablegate to one of the delegates, and they visit the Papal ablegate. What takes place there? Now then what does the Papal ablegate say? He admits that he invited them to come and see him:

Taking occasion of the presence in Ottawa of the Hon. Mr. Campbell, the attorney general of Manitoba, whom I had met in a friendly way more than a year ago, I invited him to come and see me.

Yet everything was denied so far as the premier knew or could tell.

I never met Hon. Mr. Rogers nor did I have any communication with him.

Now the Minister of Agriculture expressed himself strongly of the opinion that the whole thing was unreliable, because it was proven that Mr. Rogers was not there, while Mr. Rogers spoke of the delegation which came down in the plural number as if there were two. Well, I suppose that a member of the government referring to what the government did, if he said: We did so and so, would not necessarily mean that he was individually present. I presume that any conference that took place between the ablegate and any member of the delegation, represented a conference between the ablegate and the delegation. And that is what Mr. Rogers says, he did not say he visited the ablegate. The ablegate admitted that he invited Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Campbell came.

I asked him if something could not be done to improve the condition of the Catholics of his province with respect to education.

That is an admission that there was a conference, and an admission as well, what he was there for.

I pointed out that in the cities of Winnipeg and Brandon, for instance, the Catholics were paying double taxes. I urged my request on the ground of fairness and justice, and, referring to his mission to Ottawa,—

And what was his mission? To extend the boundaries of Manitoba.

—I remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba government, some action on these lines would be politically expedient—

'Politically expedient.' Why? Because he was dealing with politicians, and he was pointing out how they would be likely to accomplish their end.

—and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba.

MR. SPROULE.

It would be 'politically expedient,' and would help them to accomplish the mission on which they came here. Was not that diplomacy and an interference with the rights of the state? Was not that an admission that Hon. Robert Rogers' statement was correct? And if Mr. Rogers came to the conclusion that the ablegate was an intermediary between the government and the delegate, was not there sufficient circumstantial evidence to justify him in reaching that conclusion? In my judgment there was. Lawyers often depend on circumstantial evidence to establish a case. Even in the matter of life or death, the lawyer will tell the jury that circumstantial evidence is often much stronger and more reliable than direct evidence. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), an eminent lawyer, I have no doubt has advanced that plea over and over again. Applying it to the hon. gentleman himself and his government, is there any circumstantial evidence here to justify the conclusion that Hon. Robert Rogers, when he assumed that the Papal delegate was speaking for the government, and that the Minister of Justice was in it and the Prime Minister was in it? Certainly there was. He goes on to say.

Mr. Campbell then asked me what would be my desire in this respect, I then gave him the memorandum which has already appeared in the press.

This, he says, is the sum and substance of the interview. Now, what was the memorandum he gave? It was two carefully drawn clauses handed by the Papal delegate to Hon. Colin Campbell to enable him to facilitate the object he had in view—the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. He proposed to this end the alteration of the statute of Manitoba relating to education, by adding to section 125 two subsections. One was as follows:—

(b) And when in any city or town there shall be thirty or more Roman Catholic children and also thirty or more non-Roman Catholic children, or in any village more than fifteen of each of such classes, the trustees shall, if requested by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers.

That was one of the amendments. The other was to provide for exactly the same in the country—two carefully drawn, well-worded subsections to put in a statute. And what conclusion did the Manitoba delegates reach with regard to the matter? I say the only conclusion they could come to was that these clauses were drawn up by the government here. And I think that they honestly believed that they were drawn up by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Does that hon. gentleman deny that he had anything to do with the drawing up of these subsections?