

ity in Manitoba had been granted their due in 1896? If my right hon. friend, sitting on this side of the House, had not proposed the six months' hoist to the remedial Bill, and done everything in his power to prevent it passing, would His Excellency have been in Manitoba consulting with Archbishop Langevin and the minority there, to obtain for them that justice which they have been claiming since 1896? The Minister of Justice was to resign if that justice were not obtained, but he has not resigned; but by the Bill at present before the House he hopes to redeem the peace of his conscience. My hon. friend says there is no harm in having a Papal delegate here. I will not say there is any harm, but there was no necessity for a delegate here, if my right hon. friend and his party had not created such a turmoil among the people in 1896, and afterwards. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice tries to show an analogy between the trip of Archbishop Taché in 1870 and the residence in Canada of His Excellency. There is a great difference. In 1870 there was an uprising in the province of Manitoba; we were threatened with revolution; we were threatened with the loss of all the provinces in the Northwest; and we could not do anything. We had not the soldiers or muskets or cannon with which to put a stop to that uprising. There was only one way of settling the trouble; that was by the persuasion of Archbishop Taché, then the Bishop of St. Boniface, whose wisdom was held in immense respect by the people of that part of the country. Sir John Macdonald, as a great politician and statesman, knew that it was the only way to settle that difficulty, and he was not ashamed to adopt it, although he was the Premier of Canada and a Protestant, because he was working for the best interests of the country. He therefore turned his eyes towards Rome, where Archbishop Taché was at the time, and invited him to come here, not in the interest of one religion or another, but in the interest of Canada.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not so bad for the hierarchy.

Mr. BERGERON. Archbishop Taché came, and he accomplished what he came for; and many promises were made to him then.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, many promises were made to him and to his people, and he afterwards regretted what had happened, and expressed that regret very often before he died.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Who made the promises?

Mr. BERGERON. It does not make any difference whether they were made by a Conservative administration or by a Liberal

Mr. BERGERON.

administration. Archbishop Taché is dead, but the people living there are the successors of those to whom the promises were made. Suppose they were made by a Conservative administration; was it the duty of the Liberal party later on, and principally in 1896, to do everything in their power to prevent the Conservative administration from fulfilling its promises to Archbishop Taché? Some of those promises were that the minority would be allowed to have separate schools, that they would have the use of the French language, that they never would be troubled, that if they would allow the legislative council to be abolished, they would never have anything to fear from the majority of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD. Might I ask my hon. friend a question? He asserts that promises were made at that time by his Conservative friends. Why does he not ask his Conservative friend, Mr. Rogers, in Manitoba, to redeem them to-day?

Mr. BERGERON. I will give the answer. The remedial Bill, which was read the second time in this House, is still hanging. The question has never been decided; it is in the Privy Council; and if the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Justice wanted to do what they promised in the province of Quebec, they would bring back the remedial Bill in favour of the minority in Manitoba. That is why Mr. Roblin cannot do it. It is impossible for him to do anything of the kind to-day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why?

Mr. BERGERON. Because the remedial Bill is standing at the second reading.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Therefore he cannot interfere?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend speaks of the analogy between the visit of Archbishop Taché and the residence in Canada of the ablegate. Now, why have we a delegate here? I said a moment ago that it was a heritage of the Liberal party.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Do I understand my hon. friend to be against Canada having a delegate?

Mr. BERGERON. It does not make any difference to me personally. It only makes a difference to those who have some matters of conscience to settle with their bishops; I have not. My hon. friend from Pictou, when speaking this evening, had in his hand a book which I presume was a report of the Supreme Court. It had been given to him after six o'clock, and I imagine I know the gentleman who gave it to him.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me say that no hon. gentleman gave me that book. I have read that case long ago. I am suffi-