

of the House in reply. He was simply trying to make political capital out of this question by saying that we on this side, in introducing the amendments which we believe are proper, are trying to create an agitation in Quebec. My hon. friends are afraid of that agitation in Quebec. They remember what they did in 1896 and think that we are going to do the same thing. My hon. friend spoke about the caucus. To show him that he was wrong there I may state that we had no understanding with the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) and yet we happen to be side by side on this question. That shows that we may be on the same platform without caucus or understanding. My hon. friend at the conclusion of his speech showed that he wanted to make political capital out of this when he spoke about the petition brought into this House by Mr. Amyot in 1890. Mr. Amyot at that time was opposed to the government, he was a Liberal and was trying to embarrass the government and brought in the petition referred to. I asked if there was an answer. My hon. friend said: No, I do not see any. This is a long petition covering about two columns and a half which Mr. Amyot read in the House in the effort to show that the Roman Catholics in the Northwest Territories were ill-treated and that petition was signed by Bishop Grandin. That the petition was brought into the House on June 29, 1890. I shall read the answer of Sir John Macdonald:

Sir JOHN MACDONALD. The government have not received the letter set out in the question or any copy of it. I have been informed that it appeared without signature in the Montreal 'Witness.'

Another agitator, I suppose, according to my hon. friend:

I would simply say that the letter has never come before the government except in the manner I have mentioned. The government will attend to the complaints of Monseigneur Grandin and those of any other person, clergyman or person in Canada who has any complaint to make.

My hon. friend says to me: Did my hon. friend get up in his place to answer the letter? Could I give a better answer than the one given by the Prime Minister of Canada at that time? The whole speech of my hon. friend has about the same value as that. What a difference it makes to be on this side of the House! What a powerful address my hon. friend would have made if he had been on this side of the House, knowing him as I do and knowing his propensities in that line. He is bound to defend something in which he has no confidence, to work against his own heart and that explains probably why his

defence is so weak. If he had listened to the Minister of Inland Revenue he would have known that the position taken by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is equally logical according to the opinion of a member of the government. I shall not read that opinion, it will be found at pages 5408 to 5410 of 'Hansard.' He will find there all the reasons which can be adduced to show that the French Canadians of the Northwest Territories according to the covenants or to the promises made to the people of Rupert's Land, that is the land where we are to-day trying to found two provinces.

You may play on the words as much as you like, but you cannot come to any other conclusion than that the French Canadians who are to-day in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are the men, or the descendants of the men, to whom were made these promises of the free use of their language and separate schools. Now, my hon. friend thought that he was making a great point when he spoke about my vote on the motion of Sir John Thompson. He was trying to make a hustings speech, otherwise he would have gone on to say that a few days before I had voted for the motion of Mr. Beausoleil. Since he wanted to criticise me for one vote, he should have complimented me for another vote that I gave on that occasion. But he only drew attention to the vote taken on the 21st of February, 1890, and he said that the member for Beauharnois had voted for the motion of Sir John Thompson. Certainly I did, and I am proud of it; I voted in good company, I voted with 37 other French Canadians from the province of Quebec; I voted with Liberals as well as Conservatives; I even voted with my right hon. friend; I voted with nearly all those who are to-day in the cabinet. Who voted against me? Some of the noble thirteen who had voted against the Jesuits' Estates Act, Mr. Charlton, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McNeill, Mr. Tyrwhitt, Mr. Seriver, Mr. Weldon, of Albert. Those were great apostles in favour of the French Canadians. I voted against those men. I only mention this in answer to my hon. friend who, instead of replying to the logical argument I made, is trying to make political capital. When this session is over these hon. gentlemen will go around the country and say what they please. I am glad to be able to discuss that subject in parliament rather than on the hustings, because here they are obliged to keep within bounds; they cannot say anything they like, but on the stump they can say anything they like, and we are obliged to submit to it.

Mr. BELCOURT. A great compliment to the electors of the hon. gentleman's province.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a very unfortunate state of things. But we may have some