

ment on Tuesday last, when introducing your Autonomy Bills, which we presume represents your fixed and final decision as to westward boundary.

In view of Manitoba's very strong claims, as presented to you in the memorial unanimously passed by our legislature, and supported and supplemented in our interview, we must enter, on behalf of the province, our firm protest against your decision in refusing to grant the prayer of our request, extension of our boundaries westward, and exceedingly regret that apparently local considerations have deprived Manitoba of what she rightfully regards as a most just claim.

Respecting extension northward, we most respectfully urge it on you that this should engage your consideration and attention during the present session.

We, of course, most emphatically deny the right of Quebec and Ontario having further to say in respect to the extension of our boundaries north to James bay, or that they could advance any claim worthy of consideration that would necessitate delay in attaching this territory immediately to Manitoba.

We regard this as exclusively a matter for settlement between our government and Manitoba. We sincerely trust that upon further consideration you may see your way clear to grant the request we make on behalf of a united province.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) R. ROGERS.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me a moment ago why this letter was not included in the correspondence that has been brought down. The answer is, that I have not received that letter. It is not of very great consequence in view of the facts. It is simply a letter of protest; it adds nothing at all to the facts; but I did not receive it. This morning I asked my secretary to search and see whether or not it had been received. I have no remembrance of having received it and it is not on file. I have brought everything that there is on file on this question. Moreover, I do not think it matters very much whether Mr. Rogers wrote or did not write that letter, in view of the interview he gave and which was published in the 'Citizen' of the 20th of February last upon this very point. In that interview Mr. Rogers stated to the reporter:

Mr. Campbell and myself have been appointed to come here to plead for what is considered by Manitoba to be her just claims, before the government who are the tribunal in the case, and whose decision must be final.

When do you expect a decision?

I presume that when the Bill which is promised for Tuesday next is brought down, it will represent the government's decision in the matter.

Mr. Rogers was present on the floor of this House on the 21st of February and heard me state the decision of the government, and therefore there was not much occasion for him to write two days later asking for a decision. But this point is of no consequence. I mention it simply as a

reason why the letter was not included in the correspondence.

I have only one word more to say about the extraordinary interview of Mr. Rogers. I will read again a statement of Mr. Rogers which appears in the 'Citizen' under the heading 'Laurier's Double Dealing.' Mr. Rogers says:

We have no desire in Manitoba for double dealing about this or any other question. This, however, appears to be a favourite course of Sir Wilfrid. For example, in 1896 he signed an official statement declaring himself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question, while immediately following we find from the correspondence brought down in the parliament of Canada the following extract from a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, which he has never denied.

I have only two observations to make on this. I do not know to what Mr. Rogers refers when he says that I signed an official statement declaring myself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question. It is not of any consequence, but I do not know what Mr. Rogers means when he says that. In the statement immediately following, the impression is conveyed that the Canadian government brought down correspondence between the government of Canada and Cardinal Rampolla. There is no such thing in fact. The government of Canada never had any correspondence with Cardinal Rampolla and never brought down any correspondence, because there was none to bring down. What is true is that in 1896 my self and several of my co-religionists, having some difficulties in our own church, appealed to the authorities of our own church to settle them. There was nothing more than that. We did it, not as a government, but simply as men belonging to the Roman Catholic church. We had trouble over matters of ecclesiastical policy, and we appealed to the supreme arbiter in our church to determine these matters. There was nothing more or less. On this occasion I have nothing more to say, but I thought that under the circumstances I owed it to myself and the House simply to make a statement of the facts as they are.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. I simply wish to supplement briefly some of the remarks that have fallen from my right hon. leader. The communication from Mr. Rogers contains a statement to the effect that in the invitation of His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti, he waited upon him, and that on that occasion the Papal ablegate said that if they would make some concessions, the mission of the Manitoba representatives would likely be successful. That mission was for the purpose of having the boundaries of that province extended to the shores of Hudson bay. It was suggested that the difficulty in the way of Manitoba securing the extension could, in some way or other be removed if some concessions were made by