

people, and one of his friends said that the Reform party fought the church a few years ago, and that it even took the church to the courts and that this is an evidence that the Reform party is not in favour of a Papal ablegate. Perhaps not, but it was the Reform party that brought him here. The member for Pictou told us that we on this side dislike the Catholics and the Catholic church. That is a peculiar assertion on his part; it has no foundation in fact, not the slightest in the world. So far as I know and I verily believe it, there is no sentiment of dislike here either for a Roman Catholic or the Roman Catholic church. We have the same respect and veneration for that church that we have for other churches and for its members as we have for other members of the community. That statement of his only exists in his imagination and I want to say so. What is the gist of all this discussion this afternoon? The Minister of Agriculture gave us a very learned disquisition but he never touched the subject. He tried to draw a red herring across the track like the member for Pictou who never mentioned the issue from the moment he rose till he sat down. He tried to do like that little fish that spouts out an inky fluid in the water so as to becloud everything—I see the hon. member for Pictou is leaving the House; the sun has gone down.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will come back to oblige the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad he came back.

Mr. MACDONALD. You will find me no quitter at any time.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps I was doing the hon. gentleman an injustice. Unlike some of his friends he is willing to stay in the chamber and hear what is being said. Of all the speeches made on the other side of the House, none of them touched the subject at all. The Prime Minister told us: we will fight this battle to the end upon the very line upon which it is brought into the House. What are the lines on which the battle was brought into this House? What are the lines to-day? The interference of the church with the state. I tell him that we accept the challenge, and that we are prepared to meet him on every platform in the broad Dominion of Canada. He will find us ready for the battle, and willing to take our shame in it. The allegation is that a representative of the church has improperly interfered with the duties of the state. Who is responsible for that? Not the ablegate. He is trying to do his duty, and I do not blame him; he is representing his church. Who is responsible for it? The men who brought him here—brought him under false pretenses if you can judge from the history of the ablegate since he has been here. What did he come for? To reconcile differences between them and their church that they were unable to reconcile for them-

Mr. SPROULE.

As long as he was doing that we had no complaint to make. Is that the work he is doing to-day? Not at all. He has gone beyond the bounds of that work, and who is responsible for it? Who is to blame? Is it the ablegate? No. He is reputed to be an able statesman, a diplomat, and he was brought here by men who think themselves statesmen, but who are not equal to the occasion. Who are they? The Prime Minister was the first who sent to Rome, and he was joined by thirty-nine of his supporters. They are the parties who brought the ablegate here, who are responsible for his being here, who have been using him since, and who are bringing discredit on their church by the capacity in which they are employing him. I say that if there is any objection to what the ablegate has done, we do not blame him, and have not a word to say against him; but we blame the men who brought him and who have employed him in that work. They are the parties who are responsible, and they are the parties who will be brought to book for it as soon as the voice of the people of Canada has an opportunity of being heard on the subject. The memories of the people of Canada are not so short that they will forget it. They will not forget it by any means. I ask again, who brought him here? I have answered that question, and can my answer be denied? Is there any attempt to deny it? Not at all. There is and always has been in this country a dread of the interference of the church with the state, and there will be the same dread in the future; and when we see the first indications of that interference cropping up, we want to stop it. That does not refer to one church more than another. When I say church, I include every church, and we are ready to fight one as vigorously as another. I am speaking of a principle which is inherent in the constitution of the British empire. We have learned long since of the painful effects of the interference of the church with the rights of the state. That question was fought out, and the relative duties of each was assigned to it. But that question is cropping up to-day, and who are responsible for it? The present government; they are the parties who have introduced that question. We are told that there is excitement in the country to-day. If there is, what is the occasion of it? It is the danger apprehended by the people of Canada that we are going to have the issue of state and church to fight over again. That is why there is excitement; that is why so many letters and petitions are coming to Ottawa; that is why there is such an intense feeling throughout the country against the present government. Is there to-day any interference with the affairs of the state by any church? Need I ask that question after the information that has been given to this House several times during the last few