

Mr. FOSTER. Or was it a question put in the Senate? Let me see—you will find it in the Senate reports of 1898, page 678; part of it is on that page and the rest of it is on another page.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is the hon. member very sure it is a return brought down to the Senate?

Mr. FOSTER. I took it from a question asked in the Senate.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it from a speech made by Senator Landry?

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) rise in his place and deny that such a letter was written by Mr. Russell?

Mr. BRODEUR. I put a fair question to the hon. gentleman. He said it was a return which had been brought down to the Senate, and he thus implied that it was brought down by the government. I ask him is it a return?

Mr. FOSTER. And I found it was not a return, and I stated where it was to be found and what it was. But the point is not whether it was a return, or an answer to a question, or from a statement made by a senator—the point is: Was that letter written by the right hon. gentleman as I read it? If it was not written by him, the right hon. gentleman can now rise and deny it. Was the other letter which I have read written by his accredited and instructed representative, for whose expenses the Canadian public treasury paid? Was it written by him or was it not? If the right hon. gentleman will deny it, then that settles the controversy; but he does not deny it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know anything about the letters my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has referred to, but I do know that Mr. Russell's expenses were not paid by the Canadian public.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend says they were not so paid, I cheerfully take that statement back, and I am very glad to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. Why was it suggested?

Mr. BUREAU. What did you make the assertion for?

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard assertions made in this House—

Mr. BUREAU. By you.

Mr. FOSTER. By gentlemen on both sides of the House as to which, as soon as they were informed they were not true, they immediately accepted the denial. However, it is undeniable that Mr. Russell received money from this government, but it may have been for other services, and as the Minister of Justice says it was not for this service, I unreservedly accept that statement. It matters little on the point at issue.

Mr. FISHER.

Taking these letters as being genuine, and there is no doubt about it, I think we have found thus far in our analysis that the present Papal ablegate was not brought here and is not here to-day on account of spiritual difficulties that have arisen in the Catholic church of Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. Nor asked for by the bishops or clergy of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. This also is suggested to me: that it is not on record and cannot be substantiated, that such a personage was asked for by the bishops and the clergy of the Roman Catholic church in this Dominion of Canada. If that is wrong, it is quite in order for those who know all about it to deny that assumption; but as it is not denied, it goes to strengthen the analysis I am making, and the conclusion that 'par consequence' the only reason for the ablegate being asked to come, and being here to-day, is in order to help the Reform government out of difficulties into which they had involved themselves, and to help them out of that confusion and trouble by the intervention of a higher dignitary of the church. This House and this country will know in a moment whether that inference is a violent one or a fair one. Why, in the whole tenor of those letters, the right hon. gentleman's and the accredited agent's, there is no assumption that he has come here for spiritual or church purposes. It is all put on the basis of political or state reasons. What were the difficulties he was to settle? If they had put it honestly in black and white, they would have said: the difficulties amongst Reformers and between Reformers and Conservatives, and we want a high dignity of the church to come here and help us to smooth out those political difficulties.

But there is another very singular thing which Mr. Russell put into that statement of his to His Eminence, that is, that his senders, including the right hon. gentleman, who leads the government, writing in 1897, after the right hon. gentleman had declared that he had settled satisfactorily the Manitoba school question, had instructed Mr. Russell to remind His Holiness through His Eminence that they did not pretend to believe that 'the concessions were perfect, but they begged His Holiness to take them as the beginning of justice.' Now, Sir, is that straightforward conduct? The right hon. gentleman, I said, is paying for his tortuous policy. So he is. In 1896 he saw a bridge by which he could get into power; he was anxious to cross the bridge; he threw his principles, the constitutional principles on which he had prided himself so much, to the winds; he also threw to the winds his solicitude for the Catholic minority in Manitoba; and after he had crossed the bridge by a promise to more than one-half of this Dominion that he was the champion of provincial rights, and by a