

the extension of the boundaries of that province was hung up as the price of the surrender of the educational liberties of that province. If there is anything clear and patent, it is that the settlement of the boundaries of Manitoba was held back until negotiations could be conducted and an opportunity given to secure remedial legislation. Hon. gentleman may laugh, but I ask them is it or is it not a fact that the Papal ablegate spoke of the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba at the same time that he was negotiating with the Attorney General of that province for remedial legislation? We knew that to be the case, and hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to screen themselves behind the Papal ablegate. Why did they not go to the Prime Minister of this country and ask for that remedial legislation? There is to-day a justification for such legislation in connection with the province of Manitoba. The constitution reads that way, and we have been told by all the authorities that the law sanctions it. Then if hon. gentlemen opposite believe in that remedial legislation, they should get it by way of their party and not through negotiations with the Papal ablegate. The Papal ablegate, so long as he confines himself to discharging the functions of his office in connection with his church, may remain here as long as he pleases without objection from anybody. But the people of Ontario who are being maligned as illiberal and intolerant, do object to any foreign representative being in this country and interfering with the settlement of our domestic affairs and most of all interfering with the settlement of our educational matters. Have people who are Protestant and British anything to fear from the interference of the Papal ablegate with their affairs? Hon. gentlemen opposite, in justifying his interference, touch a very tender spot. There is a Canon Law of the Roman Catholic church and there is the syllabus of the late Pope Pius the Ninth; and when a British-speaking people see these things taking place, they recall that Canon Law and that syllabus, and there are some very strange declarations in that syllabus with regard to self-government.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Name them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman knows what they are. I shall read one or two of them. The following paragraphs are from the syllabus of the late Pope Pius the Ninth, issued December 8, 1864, and subsequently by the decree of infallibility confirmed as truths eternal and equal in authority with the Decalogue:

The state has not the right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he shall deem true.

It has not the right to enact that the ecclesiastical power shall require the permission of the civil power in order to the exercise of its authority.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

It has not the right to the entire direction of state schools.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. You are not reading the true text.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will let the hon. gentleman cite the syllabus himself, and in the meantime I will ask him to quote the letter which Goldwin Smith sent his friend the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) the other day, in which Professor Smith said that while he and the member for Labelle were friends and respected each other's religion, the interference of the church with the state is recorded in the history of Europe.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I will do that if my hon. friend will read the answer of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I leave that to history and the history of the world. There is an issue between people who profess to be Protestants and those who profess the Roman Catholic faith with regard to the authority of the church in connection with state affairs. There is a great issue, and we all know what it is, and when we see this interference of the Papal ablegate, we all know a good deal of the past and go back to it, and reading this Syllabus and the Canon Law, we fear what may follow.

I was going to refer to the position of my right hon. friend the leader of the House, and I shall only say this. There is a feeling in the province of Ontario that when he got their support in 1896 as standing out against the coercion of Manitoba, in some way he deceived them. I regret to say that the man who occupies the high position of Prime Minister of this country is regarded to-day by the people of a large section of this country and the people of my own province as having deceived them by this change of policy which has taken place. He opposed coercion then and he advocates it to-day. To-day he refuses to give the people of the west a single voice in the settlement of the school question. He has deceived the people of the west, and I leave him in their hands. Where are we to-day and what is the upshot of it all? We are on the eve of a great struggle in this country which nobody wishes to see. It is only beginning. We know what is likely to come to pass. We know, from the speech of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), that there will be litigation out of this legislation if it ever carries, that there will be a demand for remedial legislation. We know also that there will be a certain amount of opposition in the west and a refusal to comply with that demand. There will be an appeal to imperial England. Imperial legislation will be asked. We will be kept in this House this session for months yet talking over these Bills.