

Liberal members of this House and a large portion of the English Conservative members would have said: at least if we give something to one-tenth of the Catholics let us also give it to the remaining nine-tenths. I still adhere to that opinion, and I say that trying to make the people of the province of Quebec feel that the English Liberals in this House are so unreasonable as to be unwilling to grant that measure of justice, is not the proper means to take to bring about that feeling of conciliation and fair-play for which the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Solicitor General are so anxious now, and which they are so much afraid I am going to disturb. Mr. Chairman, I say here what I say elsewhere, nothing more and nothing less—I am wrong; I say a little more here than I would say in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to continue the debate but merely to ask a question, and before doing so I congratulate the leader of the third party on the vigorous reply he has given to the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Solicitor General. I naturally feel a little more pride and interest in the hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) since the information was given me last night—which I did not know before—by the Solicitor General, that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) though working from different standpoints were working for the same end, and that therefore we were naturally allies. That idea dawned on me then for the first time and I thought it was due to myself that I should cross the floor and fraternize with the other members of the party. I congratulate the leader of that party on the vigour his party has shown to night notwithstanding its youth, and it seems to me there is a more hopeful outlook for it in the future. As there seems to be a desire to get proper legal interpretations of certain clauses, I wish to put a question. In view of the emphatic statement made by the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) when we were in North Oxford with regard to the meaning of clause 16, No. 2, I wish to get an interpretation from the Minister of Justice. The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) stated emphatically that clause 16, No. 2, left the new province free to amend this educational system and this Act, or, to substitute any other Act they desired and do away with this law entirely. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) drew my attention to this portion of the clause which he said justified his statement.

In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any money for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with the said chapter 29, or any Act passed in amendment thereof, or any substitution thereof, there shall be no discrimination whatever, &c.

The hon. member (Mr. Campbell) declared that this clause justified him in saying that the province was free to amend this Act in any way it wished or to substitute any other Act for it. I then told the member for Centre York that when we reached the House of Commons I would endeavour to get a higher authority than he to interpret this clause, and in accordance with that promise I wish now to ask the Minister of Justice, if the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) was justified in the statement he made in North Oxford.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will remember that I read a statement in the House so that there might be no doubt whatever as to my opinion in respect to the construction that should be put on clause 16, No. 2. I cannot do better now than to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to do me the honour of reading that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I to assume that the Minister of Justice dissents entirely from the interpretation put on the clause by the hon. member for Centre York?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is rather a dangerous thing to assume too much.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in that assumption or am I correct in the assumption that the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) was right?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice does not deign to put his interpretation alongside the interpretation of the member for Centre York.

Mr. MONK. I return to what I mentioned a moment ago. Subsection 1, of section 16, No. 2, makes provision for the protection of the existing rights of the Catholic minority when they are in a minority in a school district, but it makes no provision for the protection of the majority where the majority happens to be Catholics, in case the legislature should wish to interfere with their rights. Has my hon. friend given that matter any attention?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONK. And is it the intention of the government to modify that section in order to meet that case?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think we will deal with the amendment now proposed if my hon. friend will permit me.

Mr. PORTER. Before this question is submitted to a vote, inasmuch as the election in North Oxford has been referred to in this debate and perhaps some hon. members in this House have a very forcible recollection of the proceedings in that riding during that contest, and inasmuch as I feel it my duty to call to your attention and to