

of that kind. His Excellency is not responsible to us, but the members of the administration are. This was not an ecclesiastical matter, it concerned no ecclesiastical matters in no way whatever, it was to all intents and purposes a purely political matter, the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. I venture to think that in addition to the explanations which were given to the Prime Minister yesterday in this regard, there should be some further explanations made to the House and to the country to-day, in view of the very frank statement which has been made by His Excellency, and which I have brought to the attention of the House. I move the adjournment of the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, in the exchange of courtesies which usually prevail between the two sides of the House, it has been customary up to this time for my hon. friend, when he intended to move the adjournment of the House in order to bring up some important question, to give me some intimation of his intention; but my hon. friend, for some reason of his own which I do not know, has thought it advisable on this occasion to depart from the practice hitherto followed by himself and by his predecessors.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Allow me to say to my hon. friend that I received no intimation whatever of the extended remarks which he offered to the House yesterday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought it advisable yesterday to give no notice whatever to my hon. friend that I intended to make a statement which concerned myself personally, and to dispute a statement which had appeared in the newspapers on a previous day. Nor did I believe, nor do I believe yet, when a member of this House finds himself attacked in a newspaper in a manner which he thinks is unwarranted, that he requires to give any notice of his intention to rise in his place and make an explanation, particularly when the matter is in no way controversial. It is also the general rule that when a member of the House gives his word in contradiction to alleged facts stated in a newspaper, his word is accepted, nor do I understand my hon. friend to dispute that rule. But to-day my hon. friend has thought it advisable, for reasons of his own, to bring up a matter which is essentially controversial, because it implies a censure by the House, and, therefore, I would have expected that the usual courtesy would have been extended to me. Had I been informed of his intention, perhaps I would be in a better position to give him an answer, which I think I can give him nevertheless on this occasion. I must say that in the multiplicity of business which I have to attend to I had read only cursorily the statement which appeared in the newspapers, given by His Excellency.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

lency, Monseigneur Sbarretti, the Apostolic delegate, and which my hon. friend read a moment ago. But all this is not very much to the point. We have to-day, according to the hon. gentleman, a new phase of this question, and I am glad to say that we have a new phase, because it is a confirmation and a corroboration of the statement I made yesterday on the floor of this House. My hon. friend referred to my statement yesterday that up to the month of January last we had no information, no official information, of the intention of Manitoba to make an application for an extension of her boundaries. Why did I do that? My hon. friend, for a reason, explained the alleged interview which was said to have taken place between Mr. Rogers, Mr. Campbell and the Apostolic delegate. In that interview Monseigneur Sbarretti was reported to have said that it would facilitate matters if these gentlemen would consent to the restoration of separate schools in Manitoba, and that if that had been done before it would have facilitated the extension of their boundaries towards the west. Well, Sir, I stated that I could hardly believe that His Excellency could have used such language, because then and there Mr. Rogers would have answered, and could have answered to the Apostolic delegate that there never had been by the government of Manitoba any demand upon this government to extend their boundaries prior to the month of January last, and therefore Monseigneur Sbarretti could not, in my judgment, have used such language in the presence of Mr. Rogers. Now to-day we have the confirmation of my opinion that Monseigneur Sbarretti had never spoken in that way to Mr. Rogers, for the very good and obvious reason that Monseigneur Sbarretti never saw Mr. Rogers. There are many things in that interview published by Mr. Rogers which turn out to be not altogether according to the facts. You have the impression from the interview which was published yesterday, that the Apostolic delegate had sent an invitation to the delegates of the Manitoba government who were in Ottawa, to discuss with him this question of the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. Is that according to the facts as we know them to-day? No, Sir, we find that the invitation of Monseigneur Sbarretti was not at all extended to the delegates of the government of Manitoba, he says he never knew Mr. Rogers; but the invitation was extended, not to the delegates, but to Mr. Campbell whom he knew before, and whom he treated as a friend. It is a very different thing to have an official interview and conversation with the delegates of a government, and a private interview and conversation between His Excellency and a gentleman who happened to be in Ottawa at the time, and who was a member of the government of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, there are many things alleged