

were provinces, and would bring into force the Act of 1875, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any ordinance of the Northwest Territories. I have here the declaration made by the Minister of Justice on the 8th of June to that effect. I have also the declaration made by the Minister of Justice this afternoon, saying that my amendment meant a re-enactment of everything which the hon. member for Beauharnois intends to secure to the minority in the Northwest. Therefore, so far as the legal strength of my amendment is concerned, I rely upon the Minister of Justice who is the legal adviser of this government and of this parliament. It may be that I am mistaken, but, I suppose, if I am mistaken, no suspicion should rest upon me in following so distinguished a legal light rather than following those whom I do not consider legal lights, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) tries to continue on his own account the efforts made by some hon. gentlemen on the other side to fasten upon me the reputation of a demagogue. And it was the friendly pleasantry of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) to couple my name with that of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). But unfortunately for the views of these hon. gentlemen, a quarter of an hour after the Solicitor General and the Minister of Inland Revenue voted with the hon. member for East Grey against the amendment of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Mr. Chairman, it is not my habit to discuss—the Solicitor General reminds me that he shirked the vote.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, my hon. friend ought to be courteous to me; I said I did not vote, because I was paired with an hon. member opposite.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is a little joke, it means simply that if the Solicitor General had been here he would have voted with the hon. member for East Grey. Now I do not mention that to make any political capital. We should be broad enough to consider the value of motions brought before the House, without trying to make capital out of the fact that this or that gentleman votes for them. I have declared that I was opposed to clause 16, No. 2 brought in by the government, and I said that I was standing upon the same ground that the whole Liberal party occupied on the 21st of February; and if I am a demagogue now, and if my name should be coupled with that of the hon. member for East Grey as a brand of discord, then the whole Liberal party, beginning with the Prime Minister and ending with the Minister of Inland Revenue, are brands of discord. As I stated last night, I should not be denounced by Liberals on that ground. They may say I am wrong, that I am mistaken in refusing

to follow them in their retreat, but I think they should spare themselves the idea of trying to make political capital among their own friends in the province of Ontario by calling me a French demagogue for what I said in Montreal, in the only speech I have made outside this House, and which the Minister of Inland Revenue has denounced this afternoon as the speech of a demagogue and in which he said, I had charged the Prime Minister with sacrificing the rights of his fellow citizens. I was the only Liberal in the province of Quebec who opposed the campaign which is now conducted by the organs of the Minister of Inland Revenue, stating that there is not enough spirit of justice among the English Protestants of this country to do justice to the minority in the Northwest. When they go to Montreal and Quebec they do not make those broad speeches. Oh no, they say: It is true, the hon. member for Labelle is right, the minority in the Northwest is sacrificed, but it is useless to ask for anything more, and the member for Labelle is only a brand of discord, because the English Protestants of this country are not broad enough to give justice to the minority. What I stated in Montreal is what I stated here last night; because it is unfortunately my habit, as it was during the Boer war, and as it will be as long as I have a seat in this House, to use the same language in my province that I use in this parliament of Canada. Instead of making patriotic orations on St. Jean Baptiste Day in the province of Quebec, if I have anything to say in the defence of my people, I come here and speak openly. Let me tell the Minister of Inland Revenue that I do not seek shelter for my cowardice by saying that the English Protestants of this country are not broad enough to give justice to the minority. I said in Montreal, at the Monument National, in that speech which the Minister of Inland Revenue has denounced as the speech of a demagogue: Gentlemen, those Liberals who tell you that the English-speaking Protestants of this country are not broad enough to render us justice, are calumniating the English-speaking population of Canada. I said in Montreal, and I repeated it last night, that if this question had been put in its true light by the government, there would not have been ten per cent of the members in this House, including both sides, who would not have answered: What the minority is entitled to they shall have everywhere.

Now, the Minister of Inland Revenue has denounced me, he says I am conducting a political agitation, that I am trying to manufacture political capital for myself—or rather he has insinuated that I am trying to make political capital for myself at the expense of my party, and at the expense of the peace of this country. Sir, what were the words of the Minister of Justice? Here again, if the Minister of Inland Revenue does not agree with his colleague the Minister of Jus-