

have attained. Speaking as a French Canadian, as a man who holds different ideas probably from most of the members of this House, I say that the French Canadian race would stand higher to-day than it does if the minority in Manitoba were in the enjoyment of all the rights to which they are entitled. That, to my mind, would be a better proof of the position which my compatriots occupy in the confederation. These things show that some individuals are men of talent, but where is the race? A few of them shine, but where is the French Canadian race in the province of Manitoba? Where will be the Roman Catholic minority in the Northwest Territories after this law is passed? It seems to me that I am giving some food for reflection to the Solicitor General, which he will have to mention if he speaks again on this question. Now, Sir, it seems to me that we are confronted by two propositions very clear and distinct; the position taken by my hon. friend the leader of the Conservative party, which is, as he says, to stand by the constitution, by clause 93 of the British North America Act, and the position of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, who also says he wants to stand by the constitution, though at the same time he proceeds to amend it. The leader of the opposition says: We must leave everything to the provinces, without saying whether they shall have separate schools or not; we will have nothing at all to do with the schools, whatever they are. Well, that may be good policy, but I do not think it is, and have shown it by my vote. I am very sorry to differ from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, but I am bound to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) states my position exactly as I would like it stated. My position is that we ought to apply section 93 of the British North America Act because it is part of the constitution; and in reply to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, I said that I thought that section would leave the new provinces free to enact legislation with regard to education. I said there was a difference of opinion as to that, but whatever the result might be, I was prepared to accept it loyally, because we would be applying the constitution.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, it may be that my language did not sufficiently express my idea. I mean that the position taken by my hon. friend is to leave all educational matters to the management of the local legislature.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The first amendment will have that effect.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I understand, but it does not make much difference to my argument. The position taken by the leader of the opposition is that he stands by section 93 of the British North America Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not necessarily. If section 93 does apply then he stands by section 93.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In so far as it applies.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, if it applies.

Mr. BERGERON. Any way he starts at clause 93.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I understand it in that way, and if I am to judge by the remarks which were made by my hon. friend I will still persist in understanding it in that way. It seems to me that his remarks went to show that he had nothing at all to say in regard to the kind of schools that they should have. I heard him say that if it suited the local legislature of these provinces to enact a separate school law, he would have nothing at all to say against it. Of course, this would fall under the principle of autonomy. Well, that is the position of my hon. friend. Although I do not agree with it, I want to say that it is a manly position whether it is good or bad. We know where he is. But, that is the position of my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The position of my right hon. friend is a mixture. He wants to stand on the constitution as much as he can, but at the same time he wants to do something else. I think he was right when he proposed under the first clause 16 to apply something else to this question than the provision involved in section 93 of the British North America Act. I voted for that. That was a plain, clear proposition. But we shall see later on why he made that proposition. This amendment which is now before us means nothing at all. It is neither standing by the constitution as defined by section 93 nor does it recognize the rights of or do justice to the minority in these two provinces. It is opportunism. Will you have it white?—there it is. Will you have it black?—I am giving it to you under clause 93 of the British North America Act. That is why the amendment which I intend to propose calls things by their names. Some hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec will later on say and write in their papers that they are in favour of granting separate schools to the minority in the Northwest. But, if they are they will have to vote for the amendment which I propose, and not for the proposition which has been placed before the committee by the government. Why was my right hon. friend prompted to do something for the minority? I want to give him the credit of saying that he did intend to be just to the minority. That brings me to say why I look upon this question—I am always tempted to speak of