

it is the same thing as the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. BERGERON. But not the same wording.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I congratulate the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that it is not the same wording.

Mr. BERGERON. I mean the same thing that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) meant. I want the minority to get their rights. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) does not want that, and he is making this fuss because he wants to clear his skirts. But he can't do it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not trying to clear my skirts. I take the responsibility for clause 16 as it stands; and I took the responsibility of voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I did not walk out into the passage to avoid a vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Who did? I didn't.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This amendment is one thing or the other. If it is intended to do what the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle was intended to do, it is a vain repetition of the same thing. But I never can understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) means to do. I gather that this is intended to accomplish the object that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) had in moving his amendment. If that be the case why waste the time of this House moving the same amendment twice over?

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend allow me a question. I see in this amendment:

(c) the full liberty for the majority in any school section to have such school as it may desire.

I presume 'school section' would be 'school district.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is not much similitude between 'school district' and 'school section.'

Mr. MONK. But this raises the point which was discussed last night and which materially differs from the law which the government has placed before us. It raises the point of the protection of the majority when the majority happens to be the Catholic minority of the province in a school district where they have organized a public school. I think that appears very clearly by this subsection (c). Has the Minister of Justice any observation to make on this part of the amendment offered by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron); the protection, not of a minority in a separate school district, but of the majority when that majority happens to be Catholic and they have organized a public school?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is something I had in mind before to-day. That is some-

thing provided for in terms by the original clause 16 which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) said was not an improvement on clause 16, No. 2, when he told us that clause 16, No. 2, which made no provision for that, was better than clause 16, No. 1. Let me explain this over again. In effect the result of the legislation we are now going to adopt guarantees to the Roman Catholic minority in those school districts where they are a minority with respect to the district, their separate school system. But it does not guarantee to the Roman Catholic minority when they happen to be the majority in a school district any privileges whatever at the present time. That was provided for by the first clause 16, which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) condemned; that was the time to speak.

Mr. MONK. What does the Minister of Justice say as to that part of this amendment which endeavours to secure protection in the case indicated?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If that is intended let hon. gentlemen say so.

Mr. MONK. Will the Minister of Justice support it if it says so in plain language?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I will not support it, but I will not say that the second clause 16 is better than the first.

Mr. MONK. I will explain that when the time comes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I hope you will.

Mr. BERGERON. When the Minister of Justice said that he would vote for it and not go out of the Chamber, I want to know if he insinuated that I went out of the Chamber?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not make any insinuation; I said it right out as I always do.

Mr. BERGERON. It might be inferred that the Minister of Justice insinuated that I left the Chamber.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not responsible for the meaning the hon. gentleman takes from my words.

Mr. BERGERON. If the Minister of Justice refers to me I want to tell him that I stayed right here in the Chamber and never left my place. I never shirk a vote, and he knows it.

Mr. BOURASSA. I rise simply to explain why I shall support this amendment. I agree with the Minister of Justice that the wording of the amendment is not satisfactory. I believe that the amendment I moved last night covers all the questions of principle which the member for Beauharnois seeks to cover, and especially the point raised by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). As was clearly stated by the Minister of Justice on the 8th of June, and has