

the government which refused to give the minority their rights, is the one who should be ashamed to take the position which he is now taking in this House. He wants to know what is the difference between clause 16, No. 1 and clause 16, No. 2. Clause 16, No. 1 was crystallizing into the constitution the rights of the minority as they exist to-day in the Northwest Territories. There was some doubt as to the interpretation of that clause. Some people thought we were going to restore in that way what existed before 1892. That was not the intention. The intention was simply to crystallize into the constitution what was in existence to-day, and in order to make it clear, in order that we should not force that minority to go before the courts, we declared in the most unequivocal way what was the law and what was the protection that the minority was going to receive. That is our position. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) moved a resolution. It is very easy to blame those who are at the helm of affairs. It is very easy to throw on them all sorts of suspicion, but if my hon. friend reads his own motion and if that motion was going before the courts perhaps he would find out before the courts that that motion was not at all in this way protecting the minority. We heard the argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and I am inclined to believe that that hon. member was right to a very large extent in that respect. The motion of my hon. friend is alleged to be for the purpose of protecting the rights of the minority with respect to denominational schools. But where are there denominational schools in the law now existing? Are there any schools of that kind in the Territories to-day? There are not, and my hon. friend, instead of throwing suspicion upon men who have got just as much patriotism as he has—because I am not ready to admit that he has the monopoly of virtue in that respect—should give credit to others for sincerity in their views. I am not going to cast any suspicion upon his motives. I will be more charitable than he. I am not going to make all sorts of assertions with regard to those who differ from me, but shall always discuss the question as such questions should be debated. Let us discuss those questions without making appeals to race and prejudice. Let us not imitate what we see some persons doing to-day. They go into Catholic districts and denounce the right hon. the leader of the government—a man who is just as respectable as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. A man who is devoted to his country and who has done more for his country than my hon. friend from Labelle.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has gone into some other parts of the country and made there also appeals to racial and religious prejudices. Let us denounce those appeals; let us put an end to those methods, and let us unite in working for the welfare and development of this country.

Mr. BERGERON. To those who do not know how we carry on politics in the province of Quebec to-day, I say we have just had an example of it in this harangue delivered by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. For the last eight years in that province every time we try to talk politics, this is the sort of violent appeal we have always heard. Not being able to discuss the questions which we bring before the people, our hon. friends opposite always resort to their favourite policy of carrying a big flag in their hands and waving it. Had I any doubt regarding the efficacy of my amendment, the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) would have dispelled it. My hon. friend well knows what that amendment will signify to the people of the province of Quebec. I have not made any frantic appeals in my argument on that amendment to creed or race or sentiment of any kind. I leave it to the judgment of the House whether I did not speak in a most courteous way. I challenge any man on either side to say the contrary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Did I say a word about race or religion in any shape or form? I discussed the question as I understood it and ended my remarks by a motion, in which there is nothing to offend the susceptibilities of anybody, which to my mind, is as clear as day, and which cannot be answered by the hon. gentlemen opposite. There seems to be a concerted plan between my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who has had to swallow the amendment of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, who finds himself in the same humiliating plight. Not being able to controvert this amendment, the Minister of Justice played upon words and tried to cast ridicule on it. Then my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue is very anxious to have some information. He does not quite understand where I want to go, but he himself is prepared, in company with the Minister of Justice, to vote with both hands for the amendment dictated to them by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). The Minister of Inland Revenue is accustomed to go on the hustings of the province of Quebec, and he has his plan of campaign cut and dried. When this question comes to be discussed before the people he will say to them: The Prime Minister was devoured with a desire to give the Catholic minority in the Northwest Territories all the rights and privileges to which they were entitled. But Mr. Borden and Dr. Sproule—those bad