

statement that the government as at present constituted would never apply to the imperial authorities for any interference on their part with respect to this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad to have that assurance from the Minister of Justice, but he recollects no doubt that a suggestion was made by my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and by another very important gentleman on the other side.

An hon. MEMBER. Postmaster General.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am informed that a very prominent member of the administration, the Postmaster General, made the same suggestion with regard to carrying out the intention of the government even if it should be beyond their powers under the British North America Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to know from my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) where we stand with regard to this amendment? As we are aware two educational systems have been in force in the Northwest Territories; one under the ordinances from 1884 to 1892 and the other from 1892 to the present date. The motion, as the hon. gentleman admits, is not very well drafted, and if that motion should be adopted I would like to know whether under it we would adopt the educational system of 1884 or the system of 1892, or whether we would adopt another system altogether?

Mr. BERGERON. In the meantime I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) for which system he stands?

Mr. BRODEUR. I stand, and the governments stand, for the system which is now in existence in the Northwest Territories. I want to crystallize into the constitution the system just now in existence in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) stand for the whole system in the Northwest Territories, or only that part of the system as it applied to separate schools?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was stated by the leader of the government when the Bill was introduced, it is stated in the amendment proposed by the government, that we stand for the system in existence to-day. When clause 16, No. 1 was introduced we were convinced that it carried out the system now in existence, and which has been recognized by the law. However, in order to put it very clearly and in order that there should be no misunderstanding, we have put into the amended clause the existing ordinances so as to embody these ordinances in the constitution. There is no doubt as to the position of the government on that matter. I presume that now my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will tell us on what ground he stands.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it correct, as stated by my hon. friend from Montmagny—quoting from the speech of the Minister of Inland Revenue—that in 1894 the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) thought the existing system was a very poor system, and he was very much pained that it did not go far enough?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. I expressed at that time my dissatisfaction with the policy of the Conservative government which refused to disallow these ordinances, when Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister, himself declared that these ordinances were illegal and ultra vires. I thought the government of Sir John Thompson should have disallowed these ordinances. Now, these ordinances have been accepted by the minority there; instead of taking proceedings in the court to have these ordinances declared ultra vires they accepted them and they have been working under them since 1892. I do not see why the government to-day should not embody in the constitution these ordinances which have been accepted by the minority since 1892. That is the position taken by the government and there can be no dispute as to that. Will my hon. friend from Beauharnois be good enough to tell me what system his amendment would establish?

Mr. BERGERON. I will carry out my promise to my hon. friend to give him an answer. In the first place permit me to congratulate him on the facility with which he can change his mind. There is no doubt he was in favour of clause 16, No. 1, because it was proposed by the government of which he is a member and I have not heard that he sent in his resignation. He is now in favour of clause 16, No. 2. I think it was Bismarck who said the language was given us to conceal our thoughts.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Talleyrand.

Mr. BERGERON. Another great man. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) is proving that the cynicism of Talleyrand is true. He is in favour of clause 16, No. 2 to-night, but he does not give his reasons for being in favour of it. However, I will give him my reasons for the faith that is in me. Since the parliament of Canada has declared by a majority of over eighty votes not to adopt section 93 of the British North America Act in the sense mentioned by the leader of the opposition, but to amend it so as to give the minority in the Northwest Territories their rights and privileges; I am in favour of restoring to that minority their full rights and not a shadow of their rights. I am for the granting of those rights and privileges in their entirety to the minority and in my opinion clause 16, No. 1, guaranteed that because I believe it was putting in force the principle enacted in 1875 of giving separate schools in their entirety to the Catholic minority of the Northwest Territories. I am