

or the 'News.' These newspapers are trying to create outside of Ontario the impression that Ontario is one of the most ignorant places on earth. I refuse to believe that. I refuse to believe that a majority of the people of Ontario can be carried by such an appeal. If any constituency in Ontario should be opened, I would be prepared to enter it, and unless the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), and the hon. member for Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), with his man Turpin and the seventeen men who took General de Villiers and let him skip off the next morning—unless these two gentlemen would come together and throw stones at me, I do not think I would be prevented from speaking in Ontario, standing for the rights of my people, for the rights of justice in this country; standing for the good reputation of our country, and saying that it is just as legitimate for the Catholics to have here a representative of the highest spiritual authority on earth, as it is legitimate for the government of any civilized country to have a representative of the Pope, to have an ablegate to look after what? Not to look after political questions, but to look after the interests of the church. And what are the interests of the church in any country? The interests of the church include everything which looks to the development of the religion to which that church belongs and all such things must be looked after by that Papal ablegate.

I know nothing of what may have occurred between Monseigneur Sbarretti and Mr. Rogers, and I think it is most absurd to come into this House and ask any member of the federal House to give an account of what may have occurred between the Papal ablegate and a member of the Manitoba cabinet. If the hon. member for South York was so excited over the liberties of the people of Canada, he should have had some friend in the Manitoba house to raise the question and put Mr. Rogers on trial in Manitoba, before the people of that province, to whom he is responsible. If, Sir, it is such a nasty thing for the Catholics to have called for an ablegate to come into this country to look after their own affairs, after their own interests as Catholics, how is it that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has nothing to say against Mr. Rogers, a Protestant statesman, who comes here and entertains relations with Monseigneur Sbarretti? If it was a sin, and a sin for which any man in this House should be arraigned before the people of Canada, if it was a sin for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, for Mr. Brodeur, for Mr. Lemieux, for Mr. Bourassa, or any other hon. gentleman in this House to ask the Pope to, send a representative to look after their own affairs, then what a crime has been committed by a member of the Manitoba government and of the legislative assembly of Manitoba, by a Protestant

statesman, in having an interview with Monseigneur Sbarretti? I do not suppose that Mr. Rogers was troubled in his conscience and wanted to get absolution for his sins. So I presume that he visited His Excellency, acting in his official and political capacity. Therefore, if anybody must be denounced before the Protestantism of this country, if anybody must be denounced before the crowds of the county of South York, and must be burned or brought to the scaffold, it is Mr. Rogers, member of the Manitoba government. But, Sir, no, I would never think of making that kind of appeal; I acknowledge Mr. Rogers' right to go and meet Monseigneur Sbarretti and have a conversation with him. If the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam Hughes), would go and see Monseigneur Sbarretti and talk with him, I think it would do them a great deal of good—if any improvement is possible for those gentlemen—I am sure it would do them good. As for the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I do not think any improvement is possible with him, because I think he is desperately sincere.

But, coming back to our action in having a Papal ablegate to be appointed, we did it because we thought it was our duty to do it. Monseigneur Sbarretti has succeeded Monseigneur Falconio in the same capacity that Monseigneur Martinelli exercised at Washington where he has been succeeded by Monseigneur Falconio transferred from Ottawa. These prelates have been here representing the church, to look after the interests of the Roman Catholics of Canada. As I have said, I know nothing of what passed between Mr. Rogers and Monseigneur Sbarretti, and I would advise the hon. member for South York to call on them if he wants to know what transpired between them. But suppose that Monseigneur Sbarretti did discuss with Mr. Rogers the rights of the Catholics of Manitoba, suppose he did ask Mr. Rogers to do something for the Catholics of Manitoba, where in the name of justice and common sense is there anything wrong in that? Here is a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, sent here to look after the interests of the people belonging to his church, and what harm is there in his meeting another gentleman and asking him if something could not be done for the interests of his people? Now, we have in this city a consul from the United States, he is here to look after the interests of the American people living in this country and the interests of American citizens who may be trading in this country; suppose he finds something in our tariff which he thinks is prejudicial to their interests, would it be a great sin for that gentleman to meet the Minister of Trade and Commerce and ask if some change could not be made? Sir, it is about time that we should look at these questions from a common sense point of