

duties of this Papal delegate? We were told that his duties were to settle differences between the Roman Catholic people and the church and as long as he confines himself to those duties we have no complaint to make. It is a fact well known in this country that in 1896 there was a difference between the present Reform party, or at least one portion of that party, the Roman Catholic element of the party, and the bishops in regard to the school question and it was said that the Papal delegate was brought here for the purpose of settling that difficulty. So long as he attempted to settle that difficulty you heard no complaint from any Protestant in this country as to what he was doing and no complaint that he was here. But, is he confining himself to the interests of the church? The hon. member for Labelle says that he has a perfect right in the interests of his church and of his co-religionists to take part in anything which is going on and in which that church is directly interested. In my judgment he has no right to go the distance that it is alleged he has gone. Now, it is said sometimes, and I think correctly said, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The history of the ages has taught that lesson over and over again, and the maxim is as true to-day as when it was first announced. The complete separation of church and state is another principle recognized in the history of the English parliament long ago. That principle was adopted in constitutional government, and we are trying to live up to it and we desire to carry it out to the fullest extent. When we took the clergy reserve lands from the church and distributed them for the benefit of the state we asserted that principle because we desired there should be no semblance of connection between church and state. We declared that every church should stand on its own footing and we have lived up to that according to the best of our judgment. But as I said, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and when we see any encroachment on that principle we are bound to draw attention to it in the interests of our constitutional rights and in the interest of our constituents. That is what we are doing to-day. Since the settlement of the clergy reserve lands we have not had that question up until to-day, when it comes forward again in a different way in connection with the presence of the Papal ablegate here. We fought against the contention of the church in 1896, because we believed it was the church that was making the fight against the rights of the people of Manitoba. The Prime Minister and his friends joined with us in that fight, and I stood up here day after day and night after night to defend the rights of the people against improper interference. I am glad to know I had the assistance and support of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends in that fight. With his sunny ways and his diplomatic

Mr. SPROULE.

ability he succeeded in arranging that trouble and bringing about conciliation and harmony where they did not exist before. But it was out of that incident that grew the troubles which induced him to bring this Papal delegate here. Is there not to-day interference by the church with the rights of the state? Can we believe what appears in the newspapers of this city from day to day, that every time there has been a crisis in connection with this Bill the Prime Minister has visited that Papal delegate and every change that has been made has been made with his knowledge and on his advice. We are told that the Bill was submitted to him and that the Bill was satisfactory to him or otherwise it would not have been introduced into this House. Then there is the strange coincidence that on the 13th of February, the Manitoba delegates were invited down here to consider the question of extending the boundaries of Manitoba; on the 16th they reached here; on the 17th they had a conference with the Prime Minister who asked them to remain four or five days when they would get an intimation as to the position of the government. They remained in obedience to that request and though he said he denied certain statements categorically and in toto he did not as a matter of fact deny some of them categorically. He does not deny that he asked Mr. Rogers to remain here. And what happened. On the 17th of February they had a conference, on the 20th they were invited by the Papal delegate to visit him, and on the 21st the Bill was introduced. I noticed the Minister of Agriculture coaching the member for Labelle to draw attention to the fact that Mr. Robert Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell were with the Papal delegate trying to negotiate with him. But, Sir, they were there in answer to a respectful invitation to visit him. Did they not show respect for the high position he occupied? Did they not show the ordinary courtesy which one man would show to another when they accepted that invitation and went there not knowing the purpose for which they were invited. He told them that if they would amend their law and give separate schools to Manitoba, they could have the boundary question settled at once, but they would not agree to that and the Bill was introduced the very next day. The Prime Minister said nothing about the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba when he introduced the Bill, except to say that it could not be done, and he did not deign the courtesy of a reply to the Manitoba delegates. The Prime Minister has told us that he did not remember receiving a letter from the Manitoba delegates written on the 23rd of February asking for a reply, and it turns out that that letter was sent to the Prime Minister's house. I will not say that his letter reached the hands of the Prime Minister because it may never have reached his hands, but at all events it verifies the state-