

This hon. gentleman was in a minority of thirty, and Sir, this hon. gentleman instead of parading this racial revenge question and this religious question in North Simcoe is always toadying to the other element. He had an appointment to make in Barrie a little while ago and, expecting that the township of Tiny which has a large French vote would be attached to North Simcoe, the hon. gentleman threw aside all his Protestant friends and pushed them over in favour of a French Canadian Roman Catholic. Will the hon. gentleman deny that? I think he won't.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I will deny one part of it, that I had any anticipation that the township of Tiny was going into North Simcoe. I will admit that I recommended the appointment of Emile Sevigny as caretaker of the public building in Barrie and I am not ashamed of that appointment.

Mr. BENNETT. That shows how deep his Protestantism is. He had his friends riding the Protestant horse for him from end to end of the riding and yet they all had to be thrown overboard when at the last moment the hon. gentleman driven to the wall—for he had a majority of only thirty or forty—was in this position that he had to toady to the Catholic vote, and he dared not open his mouth in North Simcoe on that question, and had he dared to do so he would not be here to-day.

Now apart from the speech of the hon. gentleman what is all this question about? It is, as has been put by the leader of the opposition, a question as to whether or not any member of this government is responsible for the presence of the Papal delegate in this country and if any member of this government or of the government as a whole commissioned the Papal ablegate to have this conference with Mr. Colin Campbell. We heard a denial yesterday by one member of the government. What was that? When it was charged by some gentlemen on this side of the House that the government of Canada as constituted to-day had asked for the presence of the Papal ablegate in this country, up gravely rose the Postmaster General to say that he as a member of the government had not asked for the presence of the Papal ablegate here. His Excellency the Papal ablegate does not say that he did not consult some member of the government as to this interview with Mr. Colin Campbell. He makes a specific statement that he was not instructed by the government, but he did not make the statement that some hon. member of this cabinet did not ask him to have that interview and there is no denial by every member of the government specifically on that point. It has gone forth in the public press, it has gone forth from the leader of the opposition and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that in all these negotiations the premier, day in and day out, has consulted

the Papal ablegate as to the terms of this measure. That is not denied. The premier has had ample opportunities of denying it but he has not done so. The position of the Papal ablegate is reduced to this that he has made a specific denial of the statement that he was instructed by the government, but he has not made a specific denial of the statement that he was not consulted by some member of it. Every one admits the ability and the standing of the Papal ablegate in the church of which he is so distinguished a member, and does any one believe that the Papal ablegate would be so lost to any sense of common reason that he of his own accord and off his own bat, would go about negotiating as he has been doing? I am not going to traverse the ground that has been gone over by the hon. member for North Toronto as to the equestrian performances of the premier on this question. The Prime Minister has played this game of fast and loose on this question from end to end of Canada. He has gone before Ontario posing as a perfect Ajax defying the lightning as one who has been assailed by the hierarchy, and asking Protestant votes on that score. It is amusing to read the utterances of that hon. gentleman in Ontario when he felt that he had not the power of the church behind him. Let me read his utterance in Toronto on a certain occasion when he thought it was necessary for the exigencies of his political party to make a bid for Ontario support. At a great meeting in September, 1889, in Toronto speaking on the Jesuits Estates Bill, he said:

Now I believe that the whole of that Act would have passed without any trouble whatever, but for the fact that the name of the Pope is prominently introduced in it, and that it was construed in such a manner as to mean a thing which I shall presently discuss—that it was putting the supremacy of the Pope over the supremacy of the Queen. Gentlemen, I think I put the question fairly. I want to put it honestly and to discuss it manfully. I know one thing, I know enough of my fellow countrymen of English origin, I know enough of English history, I know enough of English literature to know that when Shakespeare put into the mouth of King John the proud words which he makes him address the Pope's legate

No Italian priest

Shall tithe or toll in our Dominion.

he touched the British heart in its most responsive chord (Cheers). I know this, that there is no man of English blood, let his condition in life be ever so humble, let his range of information be ever so limited, but knows this much of English history that at no time would the English people or English sovereigns allow the sway of the Pope in the temporal affairs of England (Cheers).

And cheers greeted that too.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the right hon. gentleman would go down into Quebec