

regard to her school freedom. In addition I wish to refer to another thing. Does not the right hon. gentleman, in the view of responsible government, in the full conception we have of responsible government in this country and in England, consider that he is responsible for that delegate being here and responsible for his conduct in this country just as much as if he were one of his own administration, or one of his own civil service?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues laugh, but they brought that high dignity here. He came at their request and for all the things that he does in connection with the politics and education of this country the right hon. gentleman will find that he is held responsible, and as a matter of fact he is responsible, within the full meaning of the British constitution.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has not denied his responsibility.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now, we have had it very clearly pointed out in this debate so far that the ablegate is here at the request of the government.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. That is not correct. He is not here at the request of the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He is here at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. Some gentlemen.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He is here, according to Mr. Russell's statement, which has never been denied, at the request of members of the government of Canada and at the request of members of the parliament of Canada, and I say, and I say it in the hearing of the people of Canada, that the government of the day are responsible because all the members of the government are responsible for the acts of the individual members of the government and every member who sits behind them and supports the government is responsible for the conduct of the government in this matter. We referred to Russian rule the other day. They have the procurator general of the Holy Synod in Russia, and it looks now to me as if the Papal ablegate in this country occupies the same position as a member of this government. Any way the evidence of that is not denied; it has not been denied to-day. The Papal ablegate has had an opportunity day after day of denying it. For some reason he has not seen fit to deny it and unless he does deny it, it will be taken as true that he did have that conversation with Mr. Rogers, that he did press the acceptance of these two amendments upon them, that he did tell them that if they did accept them they would find that their boundaries

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

would be extended to the north, and that the reason that their boundaries had not been extended to the west was because of their school legislation. This is something that the people want an explanation of. It is something of which no explanation has been given here to-day and if the right hon. leader of the government thinks that this is to pass off with the explanation made here to-day he greatly misunderstands the situation of this country. There is a political crisis in this country, there is a feeling of unrest that hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to ignore but it is here, it must be dealt with and there is nothing that confirms it so much as the timidity of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are afraid to do anything. They cannot fill the vacancies in their cabinet. They cannot send the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) back for the endorsement of his constituents, they are doing everything that men who have done wrong and fear public censure could do, but they are not discharging their duty as they ought to discharge it.

I do not know that the right hon. leader of the government made it clear whether any of his colleagues had been in consultation with the Papal ablegate or not, but let us recall what took place. It is well to bear in mind that there are two faiths in this country; there is the Roman Catholic faith and there is the Protestant faith, and there is such a thing as keeping faith between the two faiths in this country. How did this Bill come before parliament as far as we know from the discussion which has taken place here? The right hon. leader of the government, the hon. Minister of Justice, and the hon. the Secretary of State, three co-religionists, one with the other drew up this Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. Order.

Mr. BRODEUR. Shame.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now let me make my statement. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who are supposed to represent Ontario opinion, as far as we know, were not present when it was drawn up. Then, we have the further statement that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), both men who were supposed to represent the Protestant faith in the government,—I suppose there has been some recognition of religion in the formation of the cabinet—were not consulted. But, on the contrary, by some process of stealth, it was got past them. There is no accounting for that, but the fact remains that legislation was actually introduced by three members of the government, and I am not saying anything as reflecting on their religion in any way whatsoever, but they happen to be of one religion, and they did not consult with their colleagues before the Bill was introduced.