

ciently acquainted with my profession to have studied some of these questions. I went to the library and got the book.

Mr. BERGERON. Naturally, I accept the word of my hon. friend; but I am very much surprised if the hon. gentleman in the county of Pictou followed what took place in the county of Charlevoix in 1877.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Every law student knows the case of Brassard vs. Langevin by heart.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that so? Well, that is something new. Who will say that we have not to deal with a very religious party? They are an *courant* with all matters in the province of Quebec. The Charlevoix election took place in 1875 or 1876. Before that we did not hear of any trouble. We had bishops and priests—good bishops and good priests; at least, everybody thought so and said so. Although I was young then, I do not remember hearing any fault found with the clergy of our province. In that election in Charlevoix it seems there were some indiscretions committed by the clergy. They were called undue influence. The Liberal party at that time, indeed the Liberal party of this country has never been an orthodox party, and my right hon. friend knows it. The Canadian Club of that time, in the 60's and the Club St. Jean Baptiste of Montreal, knew something about it. They belonged to the old Liberal school of France, they were far from being religious, and they have preached their ideas in the province of Quebec, and that is why the Liberal party were distrusted by the people of Quebec. They had clubs like the Institute Canadien and other institutions of that kind, where they were not at all bashful in expressing their opinion about the clergy from the bishops down. No wonder then that the population of Quebec, being a religious population, distrusted them and were unwilling to confide their interests in their hands. That explains why they were in opposition for so many years. But during that election they took hold of this question of undue influence and brought it before the courts and succeeded. It is true it was proved that some *curés* had gone out of their way, had been over zealous. But, Sir, we read every Monday morning in the newspapers of Protestant ministers who have been over zealous in their remarks. I do not blame the Anglicans for that, I do not blame the Presbyterians, nor the Baptists, nor the Methodists, as a body. I do not hold them responsible because one or two ministers are too enthusiastic. So probably some of the Quebec *curés* were indiscreet. The election was voided, and another election took place, and again a Conservative was elected.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the beginning of our having Papal delegates here. The Liberal party at that time, or some of

their representatives, made a demand upon the Holy See for a delegate. It was most extraordinary for people who did not believe much in bishops or priests to make a demand upon the Holy See for a delegate to come over here and find out whether they were as good as the Conservatives. Bishop Conroy came here as a delegate to supervise the bishops in the province of Quebec, and to investigate the disputes. Bishop Conroy was well received, received with open arms, the Catholic population of Quebec treated him very well, in fact he was so well treated, he found everything so good and so nice that he made a report that the Liberals were very good people, were very religious people, indeed they were as good as the Conservatives, and there was no reason why they should not be entrusted with the affairs of the country as well as the Conservatives.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. And he died after he made that report, and was not replaced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Surely he has gone to heaven.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I hope he has, because if he had to carry the sins of the Liberal party with him, he needed to go to some place where he could lay them down. We did not hear much more about these things until the Manitoba affair. We all know that when our friends were in opposition the country was filled with fads. We don't hear about them now. We do not hear about Patrons of Industry, we do not hear about prohibition any more, nor any other of these side issues. Because they were not able to fight their opponent with a serious policy, they had recourse to things of that sort. When the Manitoba school difficulty came up, what a God-send it was to them. And how did it come about? Our friend, the late Dalton McCarthy, had gone to Manitoba and spoken there very eloquently. He told these people what they should do, and his propaganda took well. The Manitoba government took hold of it, and I have no doubt in my own mind that my right hon. friend had nothing at all to do with it, or any of his friends. The Manitoba government was over ears engaged in some railway deals, and they had to divert public opinion if possible. They saw that Mr. McCarthy had had great success in preaching against separate schools and against the official use of the French language, and they took hold of his teachings themselves. In 1890 they abolished the separate schools and the French language. They did more than that. As I said the other day, they kept \$14,000 worth of the property of Roman Catholics, they have got it yet, they have never given it back to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba. From 1890 to 1896 what did we see? What a spectacle there was in this country! The Minister of