

days? My answer is, yes, there is. By what church? By the representative of the Church of Rome, who was brought here by the present government. What important questions of state are under the consideration of parliament to-day? There are two. One relates to the establishment of new provinces in the west. The other is the question of whether the boundaries of Manitoba shall be extended. These are two important questions which the state is dealing with to-day. We are erecting two new provinces and giving them provincial rights and provincial powers. Then, application is being made on behalf of the province of Manitoba for the extension of its boundaries, so that it may be of a size proportionate to the other provinces around it. It is much smaller to-day. Let me deal first with the question of erecting these new provinces. One of the duties of the state is to assign certain rights to these provinces, among them the right to legislate with regard to education. The state is exercising its undoubted right to pass this legislation in this House. It is claimed, and not denied—no hon. gentleman in this House has dared to deny it up to the present—that the proposal in the Bill was submitted to the Papal ablegate; that several conferences over it took place between him and the premier, if not between him and the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State as well; and that it was made satisfactory to His Eminence before it was submitted to parliament or the country. Is that interference by the church with the state? Certainly it is.

It is as plain as anything can be, and it has not been denied. Attention has been drawn to it several times, but neither the First Minister nor the Minister of Justice have dared to get up in this House and deny it. Therefore we assume that it is an admitted fact because there is no denial, and if there was any ground for denial there is no doubt the denial would be given. It is afterwards asserted and not denied, either, that the minister in the cabinet representing Manitoba and the Northwest objected to a certain provision in the Bill—the clauses relating to education—and he struck, he left the cabinet, and carried his followers from the west with him. It was shown that there was trouble ahead, and there was a proposal to amend one or two clauses in that Bill. Several conferences took place with the western members on the one side and the premier, and with whom on the other? With the Papal ablegate, to see if they could make some arrangement that would suit the Papal ablegate, and at the same time suit the member for Brandon and his followers in the west. Several times we were told that they had reached a conclusion satisfactory to both parties, but the next day the negotiations were off again. So we were kept in suspense day after day for nearly two weeks,

until finally they reached a conclusion and it was announced to the House. But the conclusion was not announced to the House until after it was finally submitted to the Papal ablegate and was found to be satisfactory to him. Therefore, I again ask the question: Is the church through its representative interfering with the state, is it or is it not? Is the church interfering with the duties of the state, with the policy of the state, with the functions of the state? I say it is, and this is the question that is interesting the Canadian people to-day, and this is the question which will be fought out in the future. The Prime Minister says: We are prepared to accept the challenge and we will fight it out. I tell him that it will be fought out. Well, when the Bill was first presented, some of the western members objected to some of the provisions, but when amendments were made that were satisfactory to the ablegate and satisfactory to the members of the west, they were announced to the House, then and not till then. Now, who is responsible more than anybody else for these educational clauses? The Papal ablegate. I do not blame him, not at all; he is trying to do what he believes to be a good work. But the government of this country have abnegated their functions, and have given them over to the church, they have given them over to the representative of the church, and they have got him to do what they could not do themselves. They saw that the Papal delegate possessed the element of statesmanship and desired to avail themselves of his diplomatic powers and his great foresight and statesmanship to help them out of what would otherwise have been a very difficult position, and he has succeeded in helping them out of it so far. But these were matters of state policy about which the church should have no concern, and over which it should have no control. The church had no right to be consulted with regard to it.

Now then we come to the question of the extension of Manitoba's boundaries. A conference was held with the government, they hear representatives, and say that an answer will be given in a few days. The First Minister, in dealing yesterday with the statement of the Hon. Robert Rogers, said:

So far as the action of the government is concerned in this matter I wish to give the statement a direct, an absolute and a categorical denial.

'A direct, an absolute and a categorical denial.' It is said that the whole is made up of its parts. First he denies it in its parts, and then he denies it in toto. Well, after all this is done does the denial hold good? He admits a conference took place afterwards, therefore that part of the categorical denial falls to the ground, because Mr. Rogers states that a conference was held with the government, and that they heard the representations of Manitoba. Mr. Ro-