

schools being promised, he has the statements of Mgr. Taché and of Sir Donald Smith upon that point. As to the existing schools being against the conscience of the people, it seems to me that the investigation would not need to be very long. What stronger evidence can there be that the present Manitoba schools are Protestant than is to be found in the fact that when it was proposed to secularize these schools, every clergyman belonging to the Protestant Church protested against religious teaching being abandoned in them. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) also made the statement that Sir Donald Smith had been sent to Manitoba by this Government. Sir, I wish to meet that statement simply by denial. Sir Donald Smith himself has already denied it. As a member of the Government, I can say, as far as my own personal knowledge goes, and as well as the knowledge I have been able to get from my colleagues, none of us knew he was going on any particular mission to Manitoba. I do not even know now that he was on such a mission, although, from his close connection with Manitoba and the North-west, it would not be surprising to me if the hon. gentleman (Sir Donald Smith) had frequent interviews with Mr. Greenway and others up there. I can understand, Sir, the proposal for a commission to investigate made by the leader of the Opposition some time ago, I could understand the proposition from the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) to have a committee of the House to investigate, because those two propositions admit the principle of the Bill; but when a gentleman of the vast parliamentary experience of the leader of the Opposition moves the six months' hoist, he cannot deny that it is the strongest possible negative that could be given to any measure. I wish to say one word, Mr. Speaker, about what, according to my view, was a painful reference made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) to what he called a threat of the church, or of a member of the church. Sir, if the threat was not more definite than the explanation of it given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), I am sure it was not a very serious threat. But, Sir, it is not usual for members of the Catholic clergy to threaten anybody. The hon. gentleman himself admits that clergymen, as citizens, have a right to hold the strongest possible views on political and public matters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) admits that members of the clergy can carry out these views to the extent of voting for or against principles which are contrary to theirs. Well, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) goes that far, he must agree that members of the clergy have a right to tell a person or a party: If you entertain such views, I cannot endorse them, and I am prepared to vote against them. That is the right of the clergy, and, Mr. Speaker, why should it not be? Are not the clergy of Canada a na-

tional clergy? Are not the clergy of Canada composed of the sons of the men and women of Canada? Have not our clergy the same training as those who have not adopted as perfect a life as they have chosen to select? And, Sir, under their monastic gowns, do not their hearts beat as warmly for Canada as do the hearts of the laymen? May I be permitted, Sir, to mention an instance? My only brother, a Redemptorist, is labouring in St. Thomas, West India Islands, among the blacks, and in July last I received a letter from him, in which he told me that he had just completed a new home for his co-workers in that island, and he wrote to me: If it is not too much trouble or too much expense, would you send out to me a Canadian flag, because on our holidays and on the days when we rejoice, I should like to see the flag of Canada floating above the home of the Redemptorist Fathers here. And, Sir, I have a sister who is a nun in Durban, Natal, and when she writes home she is as anxious to know about how Canada is getting on as she is anxious to know about the interests of her own family. Of such are the clergy of Canada and the religious orders of Canada, composed. Sir, we are proud of our clergy. We are proud to follow them. Read the history of Canada from beginning to end. Point out to me a critical period in the history of our country during which the clergymen of Canada did not lead the people, loyal always because they were led by the clergy, loyal to the country and loyal to the Crown. In 1812, when our people were under the sorest temptation to give up their allegiance to England, because of the promises held out by the Americans, what course did the clergy of Canada take? Even in that period of 1837, when the sentiments of the French race were more moved than at any other period, when some of our own people were fighting for constitutional rights, but ignored the constitutional way in which those rights should have been vindicated, what course did the clergy of Canada take? Did not we then see the archbishops and the bishops publishing mandaments all through the country telling the people that their duty was to remain true to the Crown, and to respect the constituted authority. Why should we not follow such a lead? Sir, I do not wish to be misunderstood, and I am not insinuating that the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, attacked the clergy; but carried away in the discussion, the hon. the leader of the Opposition said that he had been attacked by the clergy. My contention, Sir, is that it is not the habit of our clergy to threaten. I know not what the threat to which the hon. gentleman refers was? If he referred to the letters which have been published in the newspapers, I do not see how that could be construed into a threat. I speak here in the presence of men from the province of Ontario, whom I have known when I was