

wanted the help of somebody and they were not proud in asking it. Mr. Greenway went over to interview the Archbishop of St. Boniface, Mgr. Taché. He could not see the archbishop, who was ill, but he saw his Grand Vicar (Mr. Allard), and what did Mr. Greenway then promise? He said that he was in entire sympathy with the Archbishop and the Grand Vicar on the question of Catholic schools and the French language as well as the maintenance of French electoral divisions.

It would be the policy of this government to maintain them inviolate and he requested his Grace to mention some one who would be acceptable to him as a member of the new cabinet.

The Grand Vicar recommended Mr. Prendergast, a young French Canadian lawyer, as one who would be agreeable to his Grace, and Mr. Prendergast was taken into the government. The government therefore, with the moral support of Archbishop Taché and the ecclesiastical party, carried the election. What took place afterwards? Everybody knows what happened in 1890 when in spite of all those pledges, in spite of the position taken by Archbishop Taché, in spite of the word of honour given by Mr. Greenway, the Liberal government abolished the separate schools and the use of the French language—that language which was the first civilized tongue ever heard on the shores of Red river. What unfortunately occurred later, we too well know. The war which had begun in 1890 lasted until 1896, and that famous clause 93, of the British North America Act of which so much has been heard during this debate, was then as now the bone of contention. In 1896, after having gone from court to court, the Conservative government then in power here, being convinced that they were doing for the best, and that they were bound to do as they did, after taking every precaution, every possible means of preventing the enforcement of drastic measures, after sending delegation after delegation to induce the Manitoba government to withdraw the measures it had adopted, brought down what we all know as the Remedial Bill. My impression is that all the debate we have had this last three or four months and all the trouble which has been created in this country, are due to the events of that time. The Conservative government in the Dominion, after having promised in the first place through Sir Mackenzie Bowell and then through Sir Charles Tupper, that they would remedy the grievances of the Manitoba minority, not relying on these promises, although these should have been sufficient, brought down the Remedial Bill. That Bill was accepted by the minority of the people of Manitoba. It was accepted by Archbishop Taché, who was the chief of that minority. We struggled for weeks and weeks and the record of the Conservative

party on that occasion, is one of which we are proud and which deserves the eulogium of every well thinking Canadian, whether Protestant or Catholic. For standing as they did by the constitution of Canada, the Conservative party were entitled to the gratitude of the country. That is why I refrain from saying anything that would reflect upon my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for the position he has taken—it is because I am convinced that to-day in his heart he thinks he is right, as at that time the Conservative party thought it was right when it brought down the Remedial Bill. Those who know the history of which I have read a few extracts, those who knew that history were not surprised at the stand taken by the Conservative party.

Of course, extremists were not satisfied. But many of the people of Canada were not surprised to see the position taken by the Conservative party. And if my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had stood up here, as he did in the case of the Jesuits Estates Bill, and said: That is the law, and we must obey it—it might not have been so much to his personal advantage, but it would have added to his reputation as a statesman—his name would have been written in larger letters in the history of this country. He moved the six months' hoist, which means the killing of the Bill. But what did this mean in the opinion of extremists—and there are extremists on both sides of politics? I will read by-and-by the remarks made by one of these Conservatives who became a great admirer of my right hon. friend, but who has withdrawn that admiration now. These people believe—honestly believe—that the French element in this country has been too strong. There are no such extremists in this House, but there are such in the country; and I do not feel aggrieved at them if they are sincere. These people said: A grand victory! Here is a French Canadian, a man of education, supposed to be the best speaker in the country, an honest man—and he is ready to put his foot on the hierarchy of Quebec; he is ready to go with us and put an end of the domination of that hierarchy; let us follow him. And they did follow him. And so the sluices were open to the flood of fanaticism, and a great many who would have stood by the Conservative party—would not have dared to go as far as the extremists went—felt free to rejoin the extremists in what they did. And so this country was given over to that element of the population. Many of these people in Ontario and in the Maritime provinces, thought that my right hon. friend was most tolerant. They thought he was above the hierarchy. They thought that he was against separate schools. But what were the facts? He spoke yesterday of giving his 'categorical answer' to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Bor-

Mr. BERGERON.