

tice, I may be pardoned perhaps if upon a legal question I prefer to take the opinion of the Minister of Justice to that of the Minister of Inland Revenue. What did the Minister of Justice say with reference to the second section 16? He said:

The second gives effect purely and simply to those provisions of the ordinance of 1901 which are applicable to separate schools, and as I have pointed out in the opinion of Sir John Thompson, the provisions of the ordinance of 1901 which merely reproduces the ordinances of 1887 and 1888 abridge the right of the Roman Catholics in such a way as to give to the minority in a school district the right to a separate school and makes no provision for a majority.

Now, the Minister of Inland Revenue stated positively that the object of this amendment was to perpetuate the existing state of things, and as I said last night and as I repeat to-night, has it not been up to this time the opinion of the vast majority of the Liberal party that, as a matter of fact, this amendment meant to secure the existing state of things in the Northwest? Now we have the deliberate opinion of the Minister of Justice that the only thing which is secured by this clause is the right of Catholics with respect to separate schools. I stated last night, and I proved by documents emanating from the Northwest Territories, that the only separate schools which can exist under the law are reduced to the paltry number of 9, and that there are to-day 150 schools organized by Catholics which receive no guarantee whatever under this amendment, and I have the word of the Minister of Justice for it. Therefore, when the Minister of Inland Revenue says that the object of this amendment is to crystallize the existing system, he is giving a straight denial to the Minister of Justice. Therefore I think I am justified in saying that either the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Minister of Justice is deceiving us and deceiving the minority in the Northwest. When we are told positively by the Minister of Inland Revenue, that the minority in the Northwest have accepted the present amendment, I tell him that they have accepted it just as the people of Quebec accepted it, because they have been positively assured during the last few months by the government supporters and the government press, and privately by members of the government, that the object of this amendment was to secure the whole existing system in the Northwest, majority schools as well as minority schools. Therefore when I have before me the straight declaration of the Minister of Justice, the member of the government who is responsible for this legislation, that this is not true, and that these 150 schools organized in places where Catholics are in a majority, receive no guarantee whatever, and when I have shown by the ordinances that in every district where Catholic will be thus situated they will be in the same position, then I say that the Minister of Inland

Mr. BOURASSA.

Revenue has no right to call me a demagogue because I simply state what has been heretofore admitted.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not say anything of the kind, I simply said that the hon. member has no right to accuse other members of being cowards, as he did last night.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman is reducing his speech to a small proposition now. The hon. gentleman, no more than the Solicitor General, has used the word 'demagogue'; but after their organs have denounced the member for East Grey as a demagogue, he coupled my name with his, and stated that I was fanning religious prejudices in the province of Quebec, that I had no idea of giving justice to the minority in the Northwest. I begin to doubt whether those hon. gentlemen have taken the trouble to learn the meaning of the word 'demagogue.' I know something of my language, I know something of the English language, and I know something of the word 'demagogue,' but after their organs have deman, in the very words of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, who tries to fan the prejudices of people without any other object than to serve his own purposes. What did the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue insinuate against me? That, without having regard to the needs of the minority, I had brought in an amendment which meant nothing for the minority, and that I was fanning the prejudices of the Catholic people of Quebec against the Prime Minister. Why, the only kind of appeal I made in the province of Quebec was against the hypocritical campaign carried on by the government organs in that province for the last three months, saying that, as a matter of fact, justice is not rendered to the minority, and that justice cannot be rendered to the minority because the English Liberals did not want to render justice to the minority.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, no. It has never been stated in any Liberal organ in Quebec that the Liberals were not willing to render justice to the minority.

Mr. BOURASSA. It has been stated positively in an article in reply to a letter I sent to 'Le Canada' of Montreal. I have not the paper here, and I do not remember the date, but my hon. friend had better not be too sure about it or we will have a repetition of the event of last night, when it was stated positively that 'Le Canada' had not called the henchmen of hon. gentlemen opposite yellow dogs. It has been stated positively in 'Le Canada' that it was true justice was not rendered to the minority by the Quebec Liberals, that they must take this measure or nothing, because the English-speaking members of the House would not agree to give more. What is the position in the province of Ontario? It was clearly expressed there a short time ago by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Field-