

ture of the Northwest Territories where it is not guaranteed by any article of treaty, or by any covenant.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Admitting that there is no treaty guaranteeing the use of the French language in the Northwest Territories—which I do not admit—would not the federal parliament have a right to establish the French language in the Northwest Territories?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Parliament is supreme. It has the right to do anything. My hon. friend has read the principles of the British constitution. But we must act as men of common sense, we must not act like children and ask for the moon. We must ask our rights and nothing but our rights and it ill becomes my hon. friend to clamour for special privileges when they are not guaranteed by the constitution.

Mr. BERGERON. If I understand well the difference which my hon. friend finds between the Manitoba side and the Northwest Territories side as far as that covenant is concerned, is this: Although the government of Canada agreed to the Bill of Rights which provided that the French language should be an official language in the province of Manitoba, and although they did not make provision for the continuance of that right in 1875 the right did not cease in the Northwest Territories, because it was re-enacted in 1877. Would not the argument of my hon. friend put the position of Manitoba and of the Territories on the same basis in regard to that question? Since the government of Canada in 1870, when they created the province of Manitoba, enacted a special clause providing that the French language should be an official language, would it not be our duty to-day, for the very same reason, since we are creating these two new provinces, to do the very same thing, as far as the language is concerned, as was done in regard to the province of Manitoba in 1870?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, because in the case of Manitoba, there was a treaty or Bill of Rights. That Bill of Rights was adhered to by the high contracting parties, whereas, in the Northwest Territories, there was no such thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend the Solicitor General remember that my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, in the speech which he delivered upon this Bill, put forward—

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not remember that speech.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will read it to my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Several speeches have been delivered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend would be attracted by the speech of his colleague as his colleague took the exact opposite of the position which he has taken to-day. I have under my hand the argument of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue who bases the right of the minority in the Northwest Territories to separate schools upon the very Bill of Rights that the Solicitor General says does not extend to these Territories at all. Does my hon. friend want me to read it to him?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I remember it now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This was the argument not only of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, but of at least half a dozen other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It was that the Act of 1875 was a legislative compact based upon the so called treaty of 1870 and that that treaty extended not only to Manitoba, but to the Northwest Territories. Now, when it is convenient for the government to take the other position, my hon. friend the Solicitor General stands up while the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue prudently remains in his seat and takes exactly the opposite position to that which was put forward by the government only a few weeks ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. We might perhaps settle the question by finding out what the views of the hon. gentleman are upon this question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will tell the hon. minister what my views are. I have taken the position, but there is no legislative compact or compact of any kind and I have stood by that. I have never argued when convenient that there is a compact and where it is otherwise that there is no compact, and I do not propose to do that. I say that if the Bill of Rights constitutes a compact, then the Act of 1877 based upon it is as binding upon this parliament as the Act of 1875 is binding upon it. That is my position and I would like the hon. minister to define his position now. He does not seem to be very anxious to do so.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, I will speak.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue and I do not agree on a question of history, I find myself in very good company, because the hon. leader of the opposition stands by me and says there was no compact prior to 1870. Therefore, that destroys the argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier upon this question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must deny myself the compliment of saying that I stand with my hon. friend the Solicitor General. I stand in the same position in regard to both matters, whereas, my hon. friend the Solicitor General stands in one position in regard to one and in exactly the opposite position in regard to the other.