

excellent system, it would be a bad thing to perpetuate it, because that is a matter which should come purely under provincial control. Premier Haultain himself has said that it cannot be improved, and that if he should be declared dictator to-morrow he would not change it. He, however, is not willing that this parliament should take from him the power to do a thing which he says he never would do if left to himself. In that respect he reminds me of the small boy who would not let the other little fellow play in his back yard, and refused to allow him the privilege of hollering down the empty water barrel. And for what reason forsooth? Simply because it was his barrel, and he insisted on doing all the hollering himself. If that be not a case of tweedledum and tweedledee, I have never known of such a case in all my life.

There is one feature, however, of the agitation which is extremely regrettable and that is the extremely inflammatory course which has been adopted by certain newspapers in this country. What justification, for instance, can be given for articles such as these. Let me read you an extract from an article in the *Toronto 'World'* from some correspondent in Manitoba and which is given all the notoriety of capital letters:

You may give it for what it is worth, but my individual opinion is that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was informed immediately by Monseigneur Sbarretti of the failure of his advances, and that the invitation to the other provinces to put forward their claims was made expressly in Sir Wilfrid's speech on the following day from personal motives of pique, because the Manitoba delegates had not listened to reason.

That is a statement made in the *Toronto 'World'*, and made in spite of the fact that the speech was not at all made the following day. The dates were falsified obviously for the purpose of creating in the public mind the impression that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had brought the delegates from Manitoba here in order to expose them to the blandishments of the Papal delegate.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech was made on the 21st February and the meeting of Mr. Campbell with the Papal delegate—mind you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rogers never met the Papal delegate at all—was on the 23rd February, two days after the public announcement was made of the policy of the government regarding the boundaries of Manitoba. That falsehood was not only stated in the *Toronto 'World'* on that occasion but has been repeated time and again both in that newspaper and the *Toronto 'News'*. I have gone through the columns of the *'News'* carefully to see if the writers on that paper ever corrected that false impression. They might have been misled in the first instance by the impression given by Mr. Rogers in the interview he published in the city of Winni-

Mr. SINCLAIR.

peg, but did they attempt to set the public right subsequently? Not at all. I have carefully gone through the editorials of that paper, and find that not the slightest attempt was made to correct the false impression to which it gave circulation regarding the First Minister. Then I find another editorial, such as the following:

Was there an understanding? That Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Monseigneur Sbarretti would deny formal co-operation in the attempt to coerce the province of Manitoba into the adoption of such a separate school system as they both desire, was only to be expected. Negotiations of this kind under circumstances involving inflammatory and dangerous questions are not carried on by an astute politician, and an equally astute diplomatist in such a way as will leave any visible trail. Nevertheless, enough has been disclosed to render it in the highest degree probable that a tacit but very clear understanding existed between them. It is not necessary to suppose that a formal conference took place at which the Papal delegate was authorized to give the Manitoba delegates the very distinct intimation that he did give.

These are extracts from the *'World.'* I shall give you now one or two from the *'News.'* Here is an editorial from that paper:

On February 13th, Mr. Rogers and his colleague, Mr. Campbell, received a telegram from Sir Wilfrid Laurier asking them to visit Ottawa on the 17th. They saw Sir Wilfrid and presented the claims of the province for an extension, and were asked to wait three or four days for an answer.

On the 20th they received a letter, not from Sir Wilfrid, but from the Papal delegate, asking for a conference. When they saw the delegate, he told them that the settlement of the boundary question would be greatly facilitated if the Manitoba government would consent to certain amendments in the school law, which he submitted.

The same criticism applies to that. They received no invitation from the premier, on the contrary they asked for the interview themselves. The date there, of course, is also changed. On the 17th they saw Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and presented the claims, and they were asked to wait three or four days. This has been denied by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose statement is corroborated by the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), and those newspapers which have circulated these falsehoods throughout the country have not apologized or tried to correct them. Another item from the *Toronto 'News'* is headed:

The Grit apostasy.

This item was published in the *Halifax 'Herald,'* which describes the *Toronto 'News'* as an independent Liberal paper.

It is doubtful if a single member of the House of Commons, either to the right or left of the Speaker, is deceived by the specious argument that the government is constitutionally obliged to create a separate school system for the new western provinces. The truth is that the Bills