

ment made by Mr. Robert Rogers, that from that day to this they have never received the reply they believed they were entitled to. Was that the way to treat the accredited representatives of the Manitoba government? Is that complimentary to the dignity of the Prime Minister of this federal parliament of his ministers. It is not. I assume that the statements made in the newspaper is correct because the First Minister did not deny it, and the next step was that there was an invitation to the premier of Ontario to set up a claim for a portion of that territory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I deny it now. I never wrote to Mr. Whitney.

Mr. SPROULE. I inferred from what appeared in the paper that by some means or other there was an intimation conveyed to Mr. Whitney that it was desired that he should put up some claim. At all events the suggestion was made in the speech of the Prime Minister, and I have no doubt he had friends enough to bring that to the attention of Mr. Whitney. At all events, Ontario set up a claim and this government took advantage of that to say: We cannot settle the boundary of Manitoba because Ontario has set up a claim to that territory. Why did the First Minister say that a settlement could only be reached after a conference between Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba? What interest had Quebec in it; it did not touch the boundaries of that province in any way. However, the Prime Minister since abandoned that contention. We do find however, that according to the statement of Mr. Robert Rogers, the boundaries of Manitoba are not extended because Manitoba will not grant separate schools; and we find that the provisions of the Bill which were submitted to that ablegate—if we can believe what appears in the press, fasten separate schools on these new provinces for all time to come. That Bill was only accepted by the members from the west when some amendments were proposed, which amendments were submitted to the Papal delegate and approved of by him before they were submitted to parliament.

Then I ask is this Papal ablegate going beyond his duty? Is he interfering with the rights of the state? In my judgment he is. So long as he confines himself to the rights of his church, we have not a word to say against him; but we respectfully deny the right of any dignitary representing that church, for which we have the greatest respect, or representing any other church, to come here and interfere with the rights of the state. In the name of this country we protest against it; in the name of constitutional government, which we represent, we protest against it. Who has been responsible for this unprecedented act? The present government and their friends of the Reform party. They brought him here, and they have not put a single check upon

him, so far as we know. I need not go into the history of his being here; but I want to ask one very important question. When all these negotiations were going on with regard to this Bill and when the knowledge that the Papal ablegate was taking a particular interest in it was so apparent, where were the Protestant members of the cabinet? Where was the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) who took such an interest in the subject the other night? Where was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who made such a pitiable excuse for the Bill, and declared that government could not be carried on in this country if it were defeated, because there would have to be a Protestant government formed? Where was the lynx-eyed Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), the only Protestant representative on that subcommittee to which the Bill was submitted? Where is there any evidence that he lodged any protest against the improper interference of the Papal ablegate? Where was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)? And, lastly, where was the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who fought so vigorously before against interference with the rights of Manitoba? It is true, he lodged his protest against the government and went out as a rebuke to them for their improper conduct; but to day he is silenced, he is chloroformed. And the other ministers seem to be chloroformed, for we have not a word from them.

Who among them represents the great Protestant element of this country? You can speak freely on behalf of the other side; but if you raise your voice as a Protestant, it would seem as if you were almost a fugitive from justice. That is the kind of toleration that we are treated to in this House. It is toleration all on one side, with no evidence of any on the other side. Let us have a little more of it on that side. Let charity begin at home. Let our Roman Catholic friends show some charity and tolerance towards those opposed to them, and then they will have very much less trouble in this country. I do not wish to continue this discussion longer, but I did wish to say, and I repeat it, that we are to-day as firmly opposed to church interference with the state as we ever were in this country. It must come to an end, and it must come to an end now. What is the logical sequence of all this? It is admitted, and the circumstances justify the conclusion, that Manitoba's boundary is not extended because of the interference of the Papal ablegate. There is no doubt about it whatever. Then, let the government say that as a protest against that interference they will extend the boundary of Manitoba, and hereby show that the state is the supreme arbiter in this country, and the province of Manitoba will get its rights. Until that is done, there will be a lingering suspicion in the minds of the Canadian people that the