

to-day and treat in that slighting manner the Papal ablegate in Canada as he did on that occasion in Toronto. In the speech, as it is reported, he was not meeting with a very responsive welcome, and during the course of his address certain things that he mentioned were hissed by the audience, and he saw that he had to go the Protestant horse. And what did he do? He made exactly that kind of an appeal knowing of course it might touch the palate of the crowd although he was ridiculing the church of which he is a member. The right hon. gentleman then as usual had two strings to his bow. His language then was very different from that in his address at a great meeting in the province of Quebec when he said that he thanked God there was not an Orangeman in the Liberal party. And how they cheered him to the echo when he volunteered that statement voluntarily to them! The right hon. gentleman has never denied that statement since. I have heard it charged in this House, I have seen gentlemen with stacks of declarations of gentlemen who were present and what was the result, there was no specific denial that he had made those statements. The fact is he has been pirouetting on both toes and he is where he is to-day.

As far as this meeting between these gentlemen from Manitoba and the Papal ablegate is concerned, I have only this to say that I believe the Papal ablegate was quite within his commission and his duties in inviting these gentlemen to meet him. He had a perfect right to do that. The Papal delegate came to this country at the request of the right hon. gentleman and his political friends and he has been in close touch with the right hon. gentleman all through these proceedings and has had frequent consultations with the right hon. gentleman in reference to the terms to be contained in these Bills. These statements have all gone forth specifically, that the right hon. gentleman had these meetings and the right hon. gentleman has had ample opportunity to deny it but has not done so. It is with the right hon. gentleman that the quarrel of the people of this country rests and not with the Papal ablegate at all. The Papal ablegate has a perfect right to be in this country just as any other gentleman might have as a plenipotentiary or ambassador to any power, but I do say that the people of this country will hold the right hon. gentleman and the members of his government responsible for what has gone on. Talk about the right hon. gentleman leading a responsible and united party which is behind him on this question. Why it is openly seen by the attitude of the Ontario members not only of the cabinet, but of the House that they are all in a condition of doubt and fear on this question. The hon. Postmaster General will not dare to take up the challenge that was thrown to him by my hon. friend from South York

MR. BENNETT.

(Mr. Maclean) the other day to resign his seat and let the question be tested in the country. The hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman), who is discharging the duties of the Minister of Public Works and has been discharging them for the past year, dare not go to the city of London for reelection as Minister of Public Works. Why? Because of this incubus of the school question. I need not refer to other reasons that deter that hon. gentleman from going back there, but if the school question were out of the issue altogether I doubt very much if he would seek a contest there. The hon. gentleman dare not go back to his riding and face this school question as it presents itself to-day.

The people of Canada have no quarrel with the Papal ablegate. They have no quarrel with the powers at Rome for sending the Papal ablegate here to do what he came to do. He came here to try and get restitution of rights, from certain gentlemen who obtained power and place by misrepresentation and fraud as against the Roman Catholic electors of this country which some day they will answer for and must answer for and the people are biding their time to get even with them. There is one consolation for hon. gentlemen who sit upon the treasury benches and those who support them and that is that they will have the full tenure of the five year parliament because they will not venture to test public feeling before their time expires. I should not have risen but for the remarks of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I think the House is tired of the changes rung by that hon. gentleman in regard to the part which he has played in the political history of Canada. While that hon. gentleman dilates at great length in this House he is as silent as a mouse on this question when he goes into North Simcoe. I have had placed in my hand the issue of the Toronto newspaper which published the speech made by that hon. gentleman in Toronto on the occasion of the Massey Hall meeting which will prove that what I stated was actually borne out by the facts. Speaking at that meeting Mr. McCarthy said:

I appealed to them in 1900 and again was successful, and that time it was against a Conservative, and I appealed to them again in 1904 upon the same ground and the same platform, and was again sustained, though, I regret to say, with a reduced majority.

The hon. gentleman was referring to this question. He redeemed himself to some extent by at last saying that at the village of Hawkstone he mentioned this question. The hon. gentleman did not acquire much distinction from having held a meeting at that village and I will tell you why. In the first place the meeting held by him at Hawkstone was held a night or two before the election. I am not saying it disrespectfully of the people of Hawkstone, but Hawk-