

Here is the first evidence of failing memory :

I regret to notice that evidently Sir Wilfrid's memory is failing him. I was in Toronto when Laurier made his speech on the Autonomy Bills.

I do not attach any great importance to that. I will not call that No. 1 of the evidences of failing memory. It is merely a casual thing and not a circumstance which would necessarily impress itself upon the right hon. Prime Minister's mind. But the next is a matter that did concern the people of Canada and is worthy of mention, and I will proceed with that :

What about his promise to meet you in three or four days and give you an answer ?

I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that that is a matter that no representative of the people could afford to forget, or, if it were arranged, could afford to ignore. And what did Hon. Mr. Campbell say ? He says :

I remember that very distinctly. It was when we were leaving and he requested that we should remain for three or four days and he would give us an answer. Mr. Rogers remained in Ottawa and I went to Toronto and returned especially for the purpose of keeping the appointment, and when the incident was fresh in our minds we sent the letter of February 23, in which we repeated the promise that Sir Wilfrid had given us February 17.

He says, in effect, that he has reason to remember, because he went to Toronto and returned especially to keep that appointment. And, while the thing was fresh in his memory, not Mr. Rogers alone or himself alone, but both drafted the letter and sent it. The letter was referred to by the right hon. gentleman with something of a sneer. It is not wise to sneer at the representative of a great province like Manitoba—not a very large one geographically, but a great one. That is not the first sneer of the right hon. gentleman. The first was when he told us of Mr. Haultain's position in the matter. Then too, there was a covert sneer at the position taken by the representative of the province, because, forsooth, he would not, on a casual reference to the school question, accept the school clause proposed, and bow his knee to this great government. Mr. Campbell says he came back and wrote this letter on the 17th. And he goes on :

And, in further confirmation of this, I had intended returning immediately to Winnipeg to attend a specially important meeting that I had arranged for before leaving, and on February 17 I wired Professor Hart, secretary of Manitoba College board, that I was unable to return owing to the further interview to be held with Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Is there any doubt about the facts now ? Do you think this hon. gentleman could be mistaken ? If he is not mistaken it comes to this, that the Prime Minister of this

Dominion has so poor a memory or is so worried by the internal dissensions in his own camp or by the applications and pressure from without that he actually forgot—for he must have forgotten—that he had promised them an answer. Yet, he was prepared, and his cabinet were prepared, and his followers were prepared to sneer, and did in fact, sneer, at this matter yesterday. I think we can count that lapse of memory number one. Then this interview goes on :

Sir Wilfrid says that I did not take much part in the discussion of the question on February 17th.

Is that a matter on which one would expect the Prime Minister to have a bad memory ? Well, Mr. Campbell says :

In this I think he is likewise mistaken as I took considerable part. I framed and moved the resolution of the legislature on which the memorial was based and was very much interested in its consideration. When we met Sir Wilfrid he asked who should speak first, and I suggested Rogers. Mr. Rogers left me to deal with the northern and eastern portion of the claim. Sir Wilfrid intimated that it was his intention to add all the territory lying immediately north of Manitoba now embraced in the Territories of Saskatchewan and Athabasca to the new province of Saskatchewan, in accordance with his agreement with the north-west representatives.

That is a matter about which there could not be any doubt. Whether that was discussed or was not discussed cannot be a subject for prolonged difference of opinion, even if it is necessary to have an investigation to ascertain the facts. It is a crucial point in determining whether Mr. Campbell is correct or not. He says further :

I pointed out to him that if the Territory lying immediately north of Manitoba, that is at the heads of Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis, was embraced within the province of Saskatchewan that the Dominion would be powerless to give it to Manitoba, as no part of provincial territory could be taken away from a province without legislative action of the province itself.

Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick agreed to this and I felt that we had secured an important concession from Sir Wilfrid in this respect, that he would not include the territory in the new province of Saskatchewan.

That is not a matter that the right hon. gentleman ought to forget. And yet there are peculiar discrepancies, unfortunately discrepancies between two or more great public men, the representatives of the province of Manitoba and the representatives of the Dominion. Let me here interject that the policy of secrecy, on which the right hon. gentleman seems to plume himself of late, deprives us of the opportunity to know what goes on in relation to public affairs. 'There was no shorthand reporter present, the communications were verbal, no record was kept,'—this is a policy fraught with great danger to the public ; and I venture to