

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend (Mr. A. Johnston) knows the parliamentary usages, does he not? And that is a very fair and very polite way to answer him. The people of my province are a most intelligent people; and when they read the proceedings of this House and see that I voted against my leader, they will understand that without any speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. That is not a satisfactory—

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) agrees to disagree with his leader.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I make the statement here—and I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will contradict me—that when the hon. gentleman goes before the people of his province, he will not condemn the attitude of his own leader and those around him.

Mr. BERGERON. One thing is sure—the government which is responsible for this legislation will get a very large share of it too.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman threatens us with the province of Quebec and what is going to happen to us when we go before the people there.—

Mr. BERGERON. I do not threaten.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want to give the hon. gentleman notice now of a question that he will be called upon to answer when we go before the people there, and that question is, why he kept this amendment back until three days after the London election?

Mr. BERGERON. That is a very small point for a Minister of Justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Give us an answer.

Mr. BERGERON. I cannot oblige the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to believe me, but I state here that I had no more thought when I prepared this amendment ten days ago, of the London or the North Oxford election then I have to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. And I do not see what possible effect my amendment could have had upon those elections. If the hon. minister knows, I shall be glad if he will tell me.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is only one thing that I have to say. Previous to the London election we had two speeches from the opposition—one by the leader from Quebec (Mr. Monk) and the other by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Both of them declared that section 16, No. 2, went further than section 16, No. 1, in favour of the minority in the Northwest. The leader

Mr. A. JOHNSTON.

of the opposition still holds that view, but the leader from Quebec tells us that practically section 16, No. 2, gives the minority nothing at all.

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. Minister of Justice wants to be fair, he will state also that I spoke on the second reading of this Bill, and that in the main, I said exactly what I have said to-day—and that was a long time before the elections in North Oxford and London. But as the hon. minister has mentioned that point, will he tell me why we were marking time three weeks before those elections came off? Who is managing the affairs of this House? Who is responsible for having legislation brought in here and pressed through the House? The responsibility rests upon the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and he is the one who can tell us why we have been for three weeks marking time, instead of going on from day to day with the business which we had in hand.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not think that this quarrel will throw light upon the legislation before us; but, having taken the course which I thought the only one that I could take with propriety, I intend to keep to that course without regard to the comments upon my conduct or upon my utterances. So far as the legal strength of my amendment is concerned, I have every respect for the opinion of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), but I may tell that hon. gentleman that I have still more respect for the Minister of Justice as a legal authority. The words of this 'worthless amendment' of which the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) speaks were taken from the clause prepared by the Minister of Justice, accepted by the whole government and presented as the means of securing the rights of the Catholic minority in the Northwest and so upheld by the government and their supporters up to the time they changed their policy.

Mr. BRODEUR. The clause prepared by the Minister of Justice included more than the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bourassa's) amendment.

Mr. BOURASSA. The only difference between the clause prepared by the Minister of Justice and the clause which I proposed last night is that subsection 2 was omitted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) himself said that that was not necessary.

Mr. BOURASSA. This was done upon the strength of a declaration made in this House by the Minister of Justice that, so far as he was concerned, he did not see the necessity of bringing in again the words of the law of 1875, because, by making it perfectly clear that section 93 of the British North America Act should apply, that meant that the Territories could come in as if they