

personal and I take advantage of this opportunity to answer certain things which were said against me. In 1899, on October 13, a dinner was given at the city of St. John to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster). It was the first time there was a question of sending a contingent to South Africa. I happened to be speaking at the time the news came and I said then, without consulting anybody—and I did not have to consult anybody, it was coming from the heart—that after the speech made by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in England, when he had said openly that whenever there would be any danger to the British flag, let the bugle be sounded and help would come from the colonies, particularly from Canada, I said then, immediately, that it was the duty of Canadians to follow up what my right hon. friend had said and that I hoped Canadians would go to the defence of that flag which is our only guarantee in this country. In saying that I said I had no doubt the province of Quebec would do its duty. I was assailed by Liberals on all the hustings of Quebec, in the many election campaigns I have made since, because I had proposed that, saying I wanted to send Canadians to South Africa, and had offered 10,000 men of the province of Quebec! I have answered that, and I am doing it now in a way it can go everywhere. I mention this because if we are to believe the stories circulated in those newspapers to which I refer and our loyalty is to be affected by our religion, I should be most disloyal, I should be most disloyal, because I happen to be a pupil of the Jesuits!

In speaking about the ordinances of 1892 my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) yesterday said, and said correctly, that the government were mistaken if they thought they would make the country believe that they could not go further than the ordinances of 1892. Of course my hon. friend, in a very delicate way, left it to be understood that if these ordinances were not disallowed that was the fault of the government then in power. But my right hon. friend accused the Conservative government of not having disallowed these ordinances in 1892. In making this argument he quoted from a report of the Privy Council of the 5th February, 1894, but he read only the conclusion of that report, which is as follows:

The committee of the Privy Council regret that the change made in relation to education—and so on.

I need not read the whole of the conclusion as it is already in 'Hansard.' But he should have read more of the report. In reply to those who say that the Conservative government should have disallowed these ordinances but were afraid to do so, let me read this part of the report, and I think the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General said something the other day very much on these lines. The contention of Sir John Thompson

was that the ordinances passed by the legislature of the Northwest Territories did not affect the law passed by this government and consequently if this government had disallowed those ordinances, that would have been tantamount to their disallowing their own laws.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When did I say that?

Mr. BERGERON. I said I was not sure whether it was the Minister of Justice who said it, but some one on that side did so. It is in any case very good law and the hon. gentlemen need not be ashamed of it. I heard it said by some one on that side, and thought it must have been the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General because it was a question of law. I take this from the report:

While an appeal in the sense of the provisions of the British North America Act, referring to appeals to the Governor in Council, on matters affecting education in the province of Canada, is not established as regards the Territories, the committee of the Privy Council feel confident that any suggestion having Your Excellency's authority would be given all proper consideration by the assembly and by the council, and the committee consider themselves justified in entertaining this confidence, more especially as in the same enactment as that under which the Northwest assembly is organized and exercises its functions (the Northwest Territories Act, section 14) the following provision is made:

That was the reason given by the government at that time for not disallowing the law of 1892. As regards the other law of 1887 or 1888, what my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said is perfectly correct. If on a previous occasion I said the law of 1892 instead of 1888, that was a lapsus linguae. The disallowance of the second one would not have prevented the first one which was in operation already, from having full course.

My amendment does not differ very much from that of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) except that to my mind it is more clear. There would be no danger of having any litigation over it, and those who are in favour of granting denominational schools or of rendering justice to the Catholic minority, those who believe that the promises made long ago to the French Canadians and Roman Catholics both in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories should in honour be kept, should stand by this amendment, which gives not only to the minority in the Northwest Territories the schools they desire—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I presume I may now put some questions to my hon. friend, in conformity with his suggestion that any questions to be put to him should be reserved until he had finished his address. I would like to put one or two. The first question is whether this amendment is in-