

men on the Conservative side—prevented him. That is the way these hon. gentlemen will talk, and when we come with this amendment—

Mr. BELCOURT. Will your friends vote for you?

Mr. BERGERON. According to what I have heard from the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Inland Revenue they are making a strong appeal to their partisans to prevent them voting for it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will they (Messrs. Borden and Sproule) vote for it?

Mr. BERGERON. I don't expect it.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. What will my hon. friend say about it when he goes before the people of Quebec?

Mr. BERGERON. I will be all right when I go before my electors, as the Minister of Justice very well knows. I have met these hon. gentlemen opposite before and I am not afraid to meet them again.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, I have met my hon. friend, and he cannot say I have ever been beaten yet.

Mr. BERGERON. Where?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Anywhere.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand it is those fighters who brag the most who are the worst fighters. People who meet me know what that means, and they are not anxious to meet me. Look at the position taken by the Minister of Inland Revenue and let us discuss it in a quiet way. He is in favour of clause 16, No. 2 because, forsooth, he cannot go any further than the ordinances of 1892. Why? Because the Conservative government in 1892 did not disallow those ordinances. Surely he is not serious? Sir John Thompson, as was stated yesterday by my right hon. friend—and it is on record—always treated those ordinances as if they were only of a temporary character and were only to last until the Territories were created into provinces. The creating of new provinces out of the Territories had been talked of for years; and when this took place an educational law would be framed which would do justice to all. If we are to accept the dictum of the Hon. Mr. Brown, which my right hon. friend quoted in his first speech on the 21st of February, and that of Sir Alex. Campbell made in the Senate, the law of 1875 passed by Mr. Mackenzie was to be the law for ever. That was the reason why Mr. Brown was so much opposed to it. He said: If you pass that law now, it will be the law for ever. Yet we are told that because the late Conservative government did not disallow the ordinances of 1892 my brave friend the Minister of Inland Revenue and his government, with a majority of 70 behind them, have not the courage to give to-day to the minority in the Northwest Territories the law of 1875 to

which they are entitled, and offer them instead the ordinances of 1901 which give them nothing. That is the position of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. Mine is vastly different. I say if you give the minority anything, give it to them fully and generously or not at all. The Minister of Inland Revenue will tell the people of the province of Quebec that this government wanted to give justice to the minority. I say from my seat in the House that we are not giving them justice. And it is because my hon. friend knows that we are not that he has got into such a hot temper. He knows that the position he is taking is untenable before the people of the province of Quebec, and that is why my hon. friend tries to cover his sense of humiliation by working himself into a simulated frenzy.

Mr. SCOTT. Does my hon. friend contend that section 16, No. 2 means nothing?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly

Mr. SCOTT. I heard his leader on the platform in London declare that section 16, No. 2 was granting more to the minority in the Northwest than section 16, No. 1.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the Quebec end of the policy.

Mr. BERGERON. No, Mr. Chairman, we have only one—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. I have only one policy. I have been in every province in this Dominion, and wherever I have been my policy has been the same. My chieftain can defend himself. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has been accustomed to be dragged after his leader, I can tell him that on this side we are not worked by strings in our leader's hands. We have opinions of our own particularly on questions of this kind. I speak for myself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has put a question to me and I desire to answer it. I say that clause 16, No. 2, the clause he is going to vote for, does not give anything to the Catholic minority of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I would like to put to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) one question. I do not rise to prolong this discussion, but, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has expressed a desire that I should follow him, I propose, in a few words to test his sincerity on this very important question. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) finds fault with the attitude of this side of the House on this particular question. He says he is prepared to go before the people of his province and denounce the attitude of the government on this question. Will he, in his place in this House to-night, say that when the time comes he will go before the people of his province and denounce the attitude of his own leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) and those who surround him?