

tice. I have a great deal of sympathy for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I need it all.

Mr. BERGERON. Perhaps he does not want my sympathy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sincere in the statement that I have a great deal of sympathy for the Minister of Justice. I understand he has had a great deal to do with the preparation of the measure which is now before the House, and it has been stated here that interviews have taken place with His Excellency, and that there were conferences with His Excellency and either the Premier or the Minister of Justice. That statement has not been denied and let me say at once, that even if it is true I do not see that any blame is to be connected with it. But, if the Prime Minister has thought fit to consult His Excellency on a question which he knew would interest His Excellency, or if the Minister of Justice has done so, I would like to know when that consultation took place. Did they consult him before they introduced clause 16 of the original Bill. I believe they must have done so. That was the clause I was ready to accept myself. If they consulted him then did they consult him afterwards when the Minister of the Interior forced the government to withdraw clause 16 and present the amended clause now before us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does my hon. friend say there is very much difference between the two clauses? Does he agree with the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) on that point?

Mr. BERGERON. I will not say that I agree with the member for Jacques Cartier, or that I disagree with him. I will speak for myself and according to my own judgment, pronounced in a very modest way, I will say that I think there is a great deal of difference between the two.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the difference?

Mr. BERGERON. I think there is a great deal of difference, but I am not allowed to discuss the merits of the Bill now, although I may have the opportunity to do so later on, because I imagine there will be some more amendments. I have sympathy with the Minister of Justice because in 1896 he took to heart the conduct of the Liberal party at that time. I hope the Minister of Justice was sincere in what he said and in what he wrote in 1896, and which in my view explains the position he now takes in regard to this measure. In 1896 the Min-

ister of Justice was a candidate in the county of Quebec, and like a great many of the Quebec Liberal members he made a great many pledges. On the 6th of June, 1896, he wrote a letter addressed to the administrator of the archdiocese of Quebec, that letter I have here in French and translate it as follows:—

Being sincerely disposed to put aside all party spirit and all question of men for the triumph of the cause of the Catholics in Manitoba, I the undersigned, pledge myself if I am elected to conform to the mandement of the bishops altogether and to vote for a Bill which will render to the Catholics of Manitoba the justice to which they are entitled by the judgment of the Privy Council, as long as that Bill will have the approval of my bishop. If Mr. Laurier comes into power and does not settle that question at the first session according to the mandement of the bishops, I pledge myself either to withdraw my support from him or to resign.

That letter is signed 'Charles Fitzpatrick.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has the bishop to whom that letter is addressed ever condemned me for anything I have done as a result of that?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend had better settle that with his bishop. This brings us to the question at issue; this is why there is a delegate here, so that the bishop cannot condemn the Minister of Justice, and I understand now why he is so anxious that the delegate should stay here. He would rather be in the hands of that delegate—for whom I have the deepest respect—than in the hands of his bishop in Quebec, who would remind him of the letter written in 1896. We might as well admit at once that the action of the Liberal party in 1896 was the initiation of the question which we are discussing in this House to-day.

Mr. Speaker, this is a heritage of the Liberal party that we are having to-day. We have heard my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, with his beautiful voice, speaking of having peace in Canada, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that religiously we have peace in Canada. These hon. gentlemen have a most extraordinary way of bringing peace to the country; peace with the bishops and clergy, by having here a delegate from Rome, who says to them, Gentlemen, not another word; peace for the minority of Manitoba by not giving them what they wanted, and leaving them still under the foot of the majority of that province. That is the kind of peace the right hon. gentleman gave to them after promising in Quebec that he would do more for them than the remedial Bill would do. Would we have in Canada to-day His Excellency, of whom so much has been said, if the minor-