

is no denial of that; there is no denial of the fact that he waited upon the Apostolic delegate at his residence. There is another statement that the Papal ablegate presented to him these amendments which he desired to be put in the school law of Manitoba, and that is the question before the people of Canada to-day. Did this Archbishop of Ephesus, the delegate Apostolic to Canada, this delegate of the Pope—did he present these amendments to one of the ministers of the province of Manitoba? And what were they? They were in the shape of a command that members of the government of Manitoba should stultify themselves by making provision in the law in Manitoba for a separate school establishment, after it had been refused by the legislature and by the people of that country, and after the right hon. gentleman had refused to pass remedial legislation or to take any hand in securing remedial legislation for the Catholic minority of that province. Well, that much has been proved. What more has been proved? What more has not been denied here to-day? What is singular is that which has not been denied. Probably the right hon. gentleman is in no position to deny it. Mr. Rogers says:

This invitation was accepted and His Excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute-book of our province it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson bay. His Excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward.

Now is that true or is it not? Is it true that the delegate of the Pope told this member of the Manitoba government that their failure to act in the past had prevented an extension of their western boundary, and that if they would give him this remedial legislation now—for it is remedial legislation that he was seeking—they would get their request for an extension to the north. The people of Canada want to know to-day if that statement was really made. There has been no denial of it to-day. The Prime Minister says he cannot deny it, but the people of Canada want to know if it is true before any such Bill as that now before the House is passed. What more took place? There has been no denial to another statement of Mr. Rogers, namely, that this office of Papal delegate to Canada was created by the hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather was created at their request—there is no denial of that. It is known now to all the people of this country that we have a Papal delegate here at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite and that is proved in this very document.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is entirely misstating the facts if he means by 'hon. gentlemen opposite' the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I did not say that, I said gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House are responsible for this Papal delegate being here.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose the hon. gentleman would feel at liberty to attend to his own church without the permission of parliament?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let me read what Mr. Rogers says. The following extract has not been denied:

It is desirable, if not necessary, that the mission of Monseigneur Merry Del Val should be or rather continued, and that he should be present in the midst of us for a more or less prolonged time as the accredited representative of the Holy See.

The hon. Minister of Justice, as Mr. Chas. Fitzpatrick, and the right hon. Prime Minister, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and forty other colleagues of theirs in this House made the representation to the Holy See and the hon. the Minister of Justice, though acting as Mr. Chas. Fitzpatrick, asked that this delegate should be sent to Canada. The statement is here and it is not denied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman can read the petition. The petition of the Catholic members was read in this House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know and it proves that statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And then, the legal agent of this government in London was used as a missionary to go to Rome to have this appointment confirmed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How much did it cost?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not know. This is an extract from the letter that Mr. Russell presented in Rome:

I have just arrived at Rome once more at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the government and parliament of Canada. My instructions enjoin me to again renew to Your Eminence the desire which I had already the honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to nominate a permanent delegate to Canada as a representative of His Holiness, who would reside on the spot, but would be outside all local interests.

That is not denied. Then, what else follows? Mr. Russell, the Canadian legal representative, wrote to His Eminence as follows:

We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in his wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice.

Now, that is a very important statement. The beginning of justice took place in 1896. The completion of justice is taking place in 1905, when the west is to be fettered in