

Mr. BERGERON. He could not say any more than that. My hon. friend could not expect a man in the position Sir Charles Tupper then occupied to go further than he did. I am sure that Sir Charles Tupper offered every possible opportunity to my hon. friend to render justice completely to the minority of Manitoba. Now, what is the use of playing on words if the minority of Manitoba did not get their rights.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not the question.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the question. To-day the minority in Manitoba, in Winnipeg or Brandon or any of the large cities are in a worse position than they were when the Remedial Bill was presented in 1896.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And that is the reason an attack is made on the delegate for attempting to get a remedy.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all, I am not making an attack. That is the proof that it is not settled, when there are pour parlars between the Manitoba government and His Excellency, the representative of the Holy See. That is the proof the question is not settled although my hon. friend has said in his letter he would resign and not give support to the right hon. gentleman if it was not settled. Where is he with his promises? He sits there and where is the minority of Manitoba when they are obliged through their archbishop and their friends in the House to come down here and try to get a settlement? The Minister of Justice has put the question to me: Has my bishop done anything to me? My hon. friend was too cute to wait until the bishop would chastise him; he was too cute, he went over to Rome, he went to the fountain. It is easier to deceive Rome than to deceive the bishop of Quebec who was nearer. Rome was far away and I declare here that the Holy See was deceived in the Manitoba settlement. I have once shown here by a document sent over to Rome that the Holy See was deceived.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend went there with Mr. Russell. We engaged Russell as a lawyer instead of the legal firm we had employed before. We were told when we voted \$9,000 for Russell's services afterwards and when we asked why they had dispensed with the services of the other firm: Oh, they were too old. Russell went there, he did the work and charged \$9,000. Nobody could see what he had done, besides going to Rome and asking for that settlement of the Manitoba school question. Then what happened? We had the visit of Monseigneur Merry Del Val. Talk about having ambassadors in Canada! The Conservative party, although at the head of this country for years and years, never contem-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

plated the introduction here of a delegate from Rome on any where else. The Conservative party had confidence in their bishops and in the clergy of the province of Quebec and they still have confidence in the clergy and bishops. My hon. friend went to Rome with Russell and at that time they had the assistance of Monsignor Proulx and Chevalier Drolet, a Papal Zouave who had had experience in Rome. They went to Rome and on Chevalier Drolet's return he was interviewed, and I need not say that that interview was well prepared. In that interview he was asked:

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.) In French.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, I shall read it in French first.

(Translation).

Q. To whom did you make representations in Rome? How did you proceed?

A. First, I went to the congregation of the Propaganda; but I found, on arriving there that the Cardinal Prefect of that congregation, under whose purview we are as a mere mission country, had been successfully forestalled by the five bishops who had come in succession to the Eternal city, since the general elections of June 23, up to my arrival on October 12. I had the honour to be received in audience by the Cardinal Prefect, eight or ten times, but the Red Pope—as the powerful president of that congregation which embraces all countries outside of Europe, is designated in Rome—had accepted with such implicit faith the representations made by the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec and Manitoba, that I was not a little surprised to hear at my last interview, Cardinal Ledochowski address me as follows in all seriousness.

And now, this is very important.

'Why does this Mr. Laurier, whom you represent as a Catholic, refuse to comply with the mandate of the Queen, ordering him to restore at once separate schools in Manitoba as they existed previous to 1890, when a good Protestant like Mr. Tupper offers to do so if returned to power?'

What is the English of this? Chevalier Drolet says that when he arrived in Rome he found that a great deal of work had been done by five bishops of Quebec who had already been there between the 23rd of June, the day of the elections and the 12th of October, the day he arrived there. These had already conferred with Cardinal Ledochowski, the head of the congregation and Cardinal Ledochowski asked why it was that Mr. Laurier whom they represented to him as such a good Catholic refused to obey the command of the Queen which command meant the immediate re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba when a Protestant like Mr. Tupper declared himself ready to give justice to the minority if he was still in power or if he was put in power. Mr. Drolet goes on to say that Cardinal Ledochowski was a very old man which explained why the cardinal would not believe him but would