

opposed to clause 16, No. 2, which the Minister of Inland Revenue accepts, because it does not go any further than the ordinances of 1901, which have deprived the minority of the Northwest of all its privileges and all its rights. The Minister of Inland Revenue has spoken very often of the ordinances of 1892. I intended to refer to that to-day but forgot to do so. They have been referred to in the speeches of my hon. friend and in the organ of the Liberal party in Montreal, 'Le Canada.' My hon. friend is generally brave enough. He was in parliament in 1892. Did he ever stand up in his seat, or did any of his friends from the then leader of the opposition, the Prime Minister of to-day, down in the Liberal party, and ask the government of that day to disallow the ordinances of 1892?

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the hon. gentleman?

Mr. BERGERON. I did not do anything at all because I accepted the answer of Sir John Thompson as I explained this afternoon. That is my answer, but since then I have not been perambulating through the country accusing any one of not disallowing these Acts as my hon. friends are doing. Even the Solicitor General does that. Having no answer to give they use the cry: Why did they not disallow the ordinance of 1892? I took the word of Sir John Thompson, but why did not the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) or the premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stand in his place and ask the government of the day why they did not disallow the ordinances of 1892? Why did they accuse any one on this side of the House of acts done by the government 13 years ago when they could have had an answer immediately by the man who knew why he did not disallow the ordinance?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Might not my hon. friend have accepted the word of Sir John Thompson just as my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) did?

Mr. BERGERON. I accepted it and have never said a word since, but my hon. friend is talking about it day after day. Why did they not prompt the government of that time to disallow the ordinance of 1892? My hon. friend was in favour of clause 16, No. 1. He has changed his mind and if he wanted to be sincere with the House, to speak from the bottom of his heart, he would say he has accepted clause 16, No. 2 in favour of the minority of the Northwest Territories for which he is going to vote to-night against my amendment which is made sincerely in favour of that minority. He will vote against my amendment and will accept the amendment which comes from the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), that champion of Catholic schools in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BRODEUR. I put a very simple question to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I wanted to know from him the nature of the amendment which he is now proposing before the House, and I thought my question being put in a civil way should have been answered in the same way. Instead of that the hon. member for Beauharnois starts to make a political speech, a party speech. I thought he was here not to make party capital out of this question, that he was sincere in the desire to protect and defend the interests of the minority in the Northwest. I thought he was here not to make party capital in the interest of his party which now is in a serious condition with regard to that question, but that he was here to protect and defend the minority. I asked him what was the purport of his motion. Was it for the restoration of the rights of the minority as they existed before 1892, or was it simply for the maintenance of the rights which are now in existence? He has not been able to give me an answer to that because I do not think his motion as drafted shows whether it contemplates the restoration of the rights of the minority as they were before 1892 or the rights of the minority as they exist to-day. My hon. friend has no policy; he is not able to proclaim before the country and before the House a policy which can be sustained by a certain number of people. They want simply to make party capital. They want simply to arouse prejudices in some parts of the country—and perish the minority in the Northwest provided they get some political gains in Quebec. If the minority can not get more than what they get to-day, to what party is it due? It is to the party of my hon. friend who in 1892 refused to give to the minority the protection which the government could then have given to the minority. The minority accepted a state of things, the minority was satisfied with accepting the situation which was made by the policy of the government then supported by my hon. friend. Now if we come to deal with that question, we have to take it as it is to-day and we have to assure to the minority the rights which are now in existence, and that is what we are going to do. But what is the Conservative party doing? The Conservative party, led by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), are they willing to protect the minority? Are they willing to give something to the minority? No, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition wants to leave everything in the hands of the provincial legislature and does not want to protect in any way, shape or form the rights of the minority. My hon. friend from Beauharnois thinks that he will gain some advantage in the province of Quebec with such appeals to prejudice. My hon. friend from Beauharnois was in the House in 1892. He, who was supporting