

promise to the forty-one per cent which has been referred to in this House that he would give them something more and better than the Tupper government could give by the Remedial Bill, and had attained power by these means, he negotiated privately or publicly with the Manitoba government, and then announced to the country that he had settled the question. As an honourable statesman, he ought to have allowed it to remain settled. The Manitoba government came to him and said: this is our utmost concession; and if he, as the Prime Minister of this country, took it as their utmost concession, why should he send an agent to Rome to say to His Holiness: I do not offer this concession as a perfect settlement; it is only the beginning of justice; send out your highest dignitary to reside permanently in Ottawa, so that, by insistence, by methods proper in themselves from our standpoint, he can bring to bear a tireless, resistless pressure, in times of party stress, in time of provincial trouble, when a government has a small support, may be, to tide them over, or when they are exceedingly anxious to get their rights in point of territory, he shall be in a position to use the influence which he knows so well how to use, and backed up by us at the proper time this beginning of justice may blossom out into the perfect fulfilment of separate schools for the province of Manitoba. That is why Monseigneur Sbarretti is here to-day. If it had not been for that reason and that policy of conduct, he would not be here to-day. What futile reasoning for the right hon. gentleman, after thirty years of political battle, to get up and make this kind of defence before the country, and think it will go down with the people: 'Monseigneur Sbarretti did what he was brought here to do; did what I asked him to be sent here for; did what I sent an agent to Rome to get him appointed to do; he did it, but he had no authority from me to deliver the goods.' Does the right hon. gentleman see the two horns of his dilemma? You brought him here; you have kept him here for those five or eight years; you brought him for those purposes; you have kept him for those purposes; and when he comes to the final, crucial point, and uses his influence, you disown him. If that is not cowardice, then let it go by its own imputation.

But my right hon. friend does worse than that. He gets up before this House and this country, and says: 'If Monseigneur Sbarretti made that promise of an extension of the boundaries of Manitoba as a political consideration to the province of Manitoba for those two proposed amendments, he did it without any authority or any well-grounded hope that we would supplement his promise.' Come now, I will put a question to my right hon. friend: Suppose that Monseigneur Sbarretti had obtained those two amendments made in the Manitoba law,

and then had come to you and told you what he had done, and had read the whole of that correspondence, giving the *raison d'être* of his being here, would you have refused to implement it? There is a question for my right hon. friend. I will put another, which is more searching still: When you say that Monseigneur Sbarretti held out a political consideration to the envoys from Manitoba, and that he had no right to do it, what estimate do you place on Monseigneur Sbarretti yourself? I refuse to believe that a high dignitary of the church, such as Monseigneur Sbarretti is, a man of his training and his parts, would by a trick endeavour to get two amendments for his co-religionists in the Manitoba school law, unless he knew that if they were granted, the other thing would be. Along what by-ways and crooked paths the right hon. gentleman is forcing himself now, as a result of his misdeeds, to tread with sorrow and humiliation.

Now, Sir, I have no more to say on this question at the present time, except to reiterate again that my right hon. friend may take this home and keep it. The people of Canada demand that there shall be no possible alliance between church and state in this country. A bishop of the Methodist church has no more right to be consulted than a layman of the Methodist church in reference to political matters in this country. And so with reference to every other representative of every other church. But can you compare a bishop of the Methodist church or a bishop of the Anglican church with Monseigneur Sbarretti? Who does not know that, with my right hon. friend in power, when Monseigneur Sbarretti, representing forty-one per cent of the people of this country, makes a plea, he holds out a hope, through his authority of a fulfilment that can be given by no other church or collection of churches in this country. Now, I can see that some one will rise on the other side and declare that I have made an incendiary speech. Why, the right hon. gentleman himself, seeing that he had no argument, had to have recourse to that kind of declamation, and it was very significant of the weakness of his case. For Monseigneur Sbarretti himself I have every respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite a number of skeptics on that side of the House. But I show my respect for Monseigneur Sbarretti by clearing him of the imputations which the position of my right hon. friend fastens upon him. So far as the Papal ablegate's position in this country is concerned, so far as his position as a spiritual envoy from the Church of Rome is concerned, he is welcome to this country may be stay here and grow up with this country and help to make it great. So far as his mission is confined to spiritual purposes in his own church,