

Minister of Canada has always exercised from the beginning of his public life, in fact before he could have been considered to be a public man, in resisting what appeared to him to be any undue effort upon the part of the Catholic Church to exercise a control which it should not in the public and political affairs of this country. Then, I turn to the columns of the Toronto 'News' written also and edited by Mr. Willison. I find in the Toronto 'News' expressions, not of admiration but of condemnation for the Prime Minister; not of confidence but of fear and mistrust. I find in the Toronto 'News' that the premier is credited, not with being a hero but with being a coward; not with being able to resist the attacks of the Roman Catholic Church, if such attacks are made, but as being a slave of the Roman Catholic Church. Then I say, what a wonderful change in two years, and I ask: In whom has this change taken place? Is the change in the man of whom the words were written, or is the change in the man who wrote the words? I look at the Prime Minister and I say: Surely his position is not changed. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, two years ago; Sir Wilfrid Laurier nine years ago was 'premier of the Dominion of Canada. He then was as he is to-day leader of the Reform party, and I say to myself: If there has been so great a change in Sir Wilfrid Laurier there must have been a reason, there must have been a motive, and where is the reason and where is the motive? Having achieved such wonderful success, having won the admiration not only of the people of Canada but of every land upon the face of the globe, I ask: What could have been the reason which induced Sir Wilfrid Laurier to have departed from that which has been his course all his lifetime. Must not his ambitions be the same; what is there to change his position? I look at the Roman Catholic Church and I ask: Is this church possessed of any greater power to-day than it was two years ago when that biography was published, or even nine years ago? Sir, I cannot see any reason to believe that the power of that church has been augmented. I remember that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did resist certain demands of the Roman Catholic Church nine years ago. Did it occasion him any loss? Has he suffered any loss of power or popularity or any diminution in his following, or any loss of prestige? I cannot see that he has suffered any loss whatever because of the action he took in 1896 or because of any action he has taken towards the Roman Catholic Church all his life. Surely not having suffered any loss from the course he has pursued, there could be no object whatever in his changing his position or mode of action. I can easily imagine that if the right hon. gentleman had suffered, in resisting any attempted influence of the Catholic Church, any loss, there might, if he was a man of

Mr. MILLER.

less principle, be some reason for a change of front. But he has not suffered any.

Then I turn to Mr. Willison, the writer of a biography of the right hon. gentleman. Has there been any change in that gentleman? I think no one can doubt that there has been a change and a very radical one. I find that when Mr. Willison wrote that biography he was a member of the Reform party and had been all his life a Reformer. But since then he has gone over to the ranks of the opposition, and, as usual in such cases, the man who leaves one church for another or one political party to ally himself to another, becomes more bitter, more partisan, more extravagant than the man who has been to the manner born and has been brought up in the fold. And I find that Mr. Willison is in the employ of a Conservative newspaper, whose subscription list and financial success depend on its retaining the support of the Conservative party. I find that he made a boast—perhaps a vain boast—but boasted nevertheless of having been the chief instrument in the overthrow of one Reform government in this country, and I ask the question: does this man hunger and thirst for still greater fame and honour along that line? I am not surprised at the change of attitude, and I am sure that the change is not in the man of whom the words were written, but in the man who held the pen and wrote the words.

Does any one doubt the motives that actuate Mr. Willison? If he does, I would ask him to look at the Toronto 'News' of April the 4th. On the outside page he will find a sort of kerosene and dynamite cartoon, picturing Monseigneur Sbarretti seated at the desk of the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister, in the garb of a messenger boy, ready to do his bidding. There you find the statement that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has become the slave of the Catholic Church and of Monseigneur Sbarretti, who is here to represent that church. Surely no man, however anxious he may be for party success, if he be at the same time a loyal, respectable Canadian, will make such appeals which can only have one object, unless he has irrefutable evidence, establishing beyond doubt, that the statement was founded on fact. But turn to the inside of that same paper and you will find, not on the front page where it would catch everybody's eye, but in an obscure space, a six-line paragraph, which reads as follows:

Hon. Robert Rogers has said too much or too little. If he can prove the interference of the Papal ablegate in preventing the extension of Manitoba's boundaries, he owes it to his own province and to the rest of the Dominion to do so.

That is tantamount to a confession that Mr. Rogers had no ground or evidence whatever for making the statements he did. It