

with what has been said. Sir, I was somewhat at a loss to apprehend the meaning of this discussion, somewhat at a loss to understand the cause of it. I must admit that, I could scarcely see the reason for resurrecting a debate that had practically ended yesterday. But when a distinguished politician from the province of Quebec, one who is prominent in the local legislature, appeared on the floor of this House this afternoon, and when I witnessed the enthusiasm of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was speaking, I realized what it all meant. And what does it all mean? It means neither more nor less than an attack upon the Papal delegate, not for anything he has done in connection with the particular question now in issue before this House, but because of the political conditions which have existed in Quebec since his coming here. Now, the events of 1896 are fresh in the minds of all of us. I have no desire to go over the old story of our troubles and misfortunes at that time. Every one here knows what took place in the province of Quebec, and knows the circumstances under which it was necessary for a certain number of Roman Catholic gentlemen in the province of Quebec to appeal to the Pope; and every one knows who has followed the current of political events that the result of that appeal was the coming to this country of the delegate. And since his coming in the province of Quebec we have had peace, and since his coming political liberty has reigned in the province of Quebec. And that peace and that political liberty are what our friends on the other side from the province of Quebec do not want, and the hon. gentlemen are now endeavouring to obtain the recall of this gentleman who has become a burden to them, because that peace of which I have spoken a moment ago has become irksome to these gentlemen who have fed and thrived on discord during their years of power. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has in the performance of what he believed to be his duty to his party brought this matter up in a half-hearted way. He has brought it up because he has thought it necessary to do it and I cannot say that with any word he uttered I can find fault. I do not find fault with the leader of the opposition; those with whom I find fault are the gentlemen who are hiding behind all this agitation and who are not courageous enough to come out and say: We want to take up this fight with the delegate and to get rid of him. It has been made a matter of reproach to us that the delegate was brought to this country and it is now said that he has been interfering with this political question in the Northwest Territories. Why, is the memory of our friends so short that they cannot go back to 1870 when the leader of

the Conservative party of that day dispatched a message to Rome for the purpose of calling to his aid Archbishop Taché, and sent him up to settle a difficulty in Manitoba? Were they so indifferent then to the influence of the hierarchy? Were they then such superior persons as they profess to be now and so anxious to separate church and state, so desirous of having nothing whatever to do with the Catholic clergy? Why did they send at that time for Archbishop Taché? Why did they bring him out and utilize his services at that time? Where is the difference? The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is pleased to laugh. Perhaps instead of laughing he will explain?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And tell us whether down in his heart of hearts he is not seeking revenge for 1896?

Mr. BERGERON. You seem to be running in advance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Reference has been made to the fact that the delegate in some way or other is supposed to be connected with this Bill, that he has been consulted in connection with it and that he represented the minority in the negotiations for a settlement of this difficult question. Am I rightly informed that in 1896 a Remedial Bill was introduced into this House? Mr. Speaker, who is there here who will tell me who drafted the Remedial Bill introduced in 1896? Who will tell me what connection Mr. Ewart, of Winnipeg, had with that Bill and whether Mr. Ewart was the intermediary between the government of that day and the representatives of the Roman Catholic minority? Who will deny it? Where is the difference?

Mr. INGRAM. Quite a difference.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming it to be true that the delegate was consulted, where is the difference in principle between the case of our friends in 1896 and the present occasion. I do not think it is necessary to take up the time of the House very long with these quotations from newspapers. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was somewhat indignant at the Minister of Customs quoting from the Hamilton 'Spectator' and he imputed motives to my hon. friend because of that quotation. What about the motives of the man who wrote the paragraph quoted? What about the men who sat silently by and derived benefit from it? What about these motives? Where is the difference between the action of the man who wrote that article for some sinister motive and the action of the gentleman who brought the attention of the House to it? Does the hon. gentleman expect that we are to allow these things to go by? Does the hon. gentleman expect