

of the opposition thought about it, and I wonder that my hon. friend, on this particular occasion, is so anxious to seek refuge in what the leader of the opposition said. If the Minister of Justice will take the opinion of the leader of the opposition as to all these matters, I think we may get along pretty amicably.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which side of that side of the House does my hon. friend speak for?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I think I can speak in that regard for all sides of this House. If the Minister of Justice wants to resolve himself into an interrogation point, well and good; but perhaps he will answer some questions on his own part. He has not answered one question that has been put to him a good many times to-day, and that is, why he substituted section No. 2 for section No. 1. He has never answered that yet. He brought in here a type-written statement of the alleged differences between them; but he has never, from the time that this amendment was first introduced up to the present time, although challenged repeatedly across the floor of this House to do so, he has never stated the reasons which induced him to abandon section 16, No. 1, after having declared that he would stand or fall by that, that the minority would never rest, that there would be no peace in this land until they got their rights. There is, according to his express statement in this House, a very important difference between the two sections, a difference to this effect: Section 16, No. 1, gave to the minority in the Northwest Territories—I use the word minority in the general sense—control over their schools in so far as teaching is concerned and in so far as other matters of importance are concerned, whereas, according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice made to this House on the 8th day of June, if I apprehend his meaning, there is not that control under section 16, No. 2.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have no hesitation in answering any question put to me in so far as I am able to do it. Section 16, No. 1, was, in my humble judgment, an ideal clause. It was a clause which consecrated a principle; that is to say the principle of giving to the minority in the Northwest Territories those rights and privileges which the law had conferred upon them. Clause 16, No. 2, is a departure from that in so far as it consecrates the system which was created in the Northwest Territories by the local authorities. Clause 16, No. 2, is a departure from that principle as far as the minority where they happen to be the majority in a certain district is concerned. If I had been alone in this matter I would undoubtedly have adhered to clause 16, No. 1, but I knew perfectly well that I could not always have my own way and I knew that under the

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

alternative it was a question of giving to the minority what they get under clause 16, No. 2, or giving them nothing if my hon. friend had power to do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the one case the hon. Minister of Justice says that there is mere separation while in the other case it is separation with control. That is about what it means?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would not like to say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not ask the hon. minister to accept that. It may be a very rough and ready way of arriving at the result. I stated before, and I still think, that the logical result of the right hon. Prime Minister's argument in this House on the 21st February and of his argument again in this House on the 22nd March would be to pass such legislation as that which was moved by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) last night and that which is moved by my hon. friend from Beauharnois to-day. The argument was that there is a compact, there is a pledge, and it is our duty to observe that compact and to keep that pledge. We have power in the British North America Act, according to the views of the government to keep that compact and maintain that pledge. It is, therefore, not only our constitutional right but our bounden duty to enact legislation for that purpose. I can understand that position. It is not a position with which I agree. I have stated my position over and over again. I do not agree with that position and therefore I voted against my hon. friend from Labelle last night, although, I am bound to say that I think he was logical and consistent and that those on the other side of the House who voted against him and who talked of toleration and the maintenance of pledges were not exactly consistent with what they had said in this House. These tolerant gentlemen who were shouting at us on this side of the House as if we were seeking to take away something from the minority in the Northwest Territories suddenly found themselves afflicted with that intolerance which they ascribed to us and they all stood up manfully and voted against the carrying into effect of the logical result of the argument of the right hon. leader of the government which they had cheered to the echo. I can understand the maintenance of pledges if there are pledges under the constitution which the government is bound to carry out, but I cannot understand merely separating these children in the Northwest Territories without giving any control, and I cannot understand the position of those who in creating that separation turn to the Protestants of this country and say: We have given these gentlemen something which may satisfy them a little, but after all it amounts to nothing and will do them no good in the