

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not want the hon. gentleman to interpret them for me.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has said that he intended to make section 93 of the British North America Act apply, and he had an object in view :

In my judgment, section 93 would bring in all the rights and privileges which exist in the Territories at the present time or at the 1st of July coming. These rights and privileges would include all those which are covered by section 11 of the Act of 1875.

That is what he aimed at. He tried to make section 93 of the British North America Act apply, and his object in making it apply was to bring in all these rights and privileges. Then we are told that the separate schools given by clause 11 of the Act of 1875 have been whittled down by the ordinances to such an extent that they are not the same thing at all as was provided in that Act. But the Minister of Justice says his intention was to give the rights and privileges contained in clause 11 of that Act. It is because the people are misled by this and because something is being foisted on them that they do not know, that we asked the Minister of Justice to explain to-night that educational clause. He has told us that he intends to deal with it on Monday afternoon. Now, in view of the fact that the country has been misled—if it be a fact, and almost every member from the Northwest says we have been misled, and so says the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), so says the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Martin), so says the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell)—

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, he does not. *

Mr. SPROULE—in view of that fact, I want the Minister of Justice to explain what the Act does mean and what it will mean with this clause in it. And after that explanation, let time be given so that, through the press, it may be communicated to the country and let the country speak with regard to that explanation. Then, I shall be satisfied. Will the hon. minister do that? But it will not do for the hon. gentleman to explain this clause on Monday afternoon and attempt to force it through at that sitting. It would almost seem that that is his desire, so reluctant is he to give this information to the country. Why did he not give it on the second reading of the Bill? Or, not having done that, why does he not give it at the earliest possible moment? If the country was being misled should he not have afforded it light as soon as possible? I say that was his duty, and, not having done it, he failed in his duty. Laymen cannot understand the Bill. Why, even the lawyers of the House do not agree as to the interpretation of it; is it strange, then, that laymen cannot understand it? And, when the Bill is so drawn

Mr. SPROULE.

that members of the House cannot understand it and different interpretations are given to the country, does it not become more important that we should have an explanation so that the country may be seized of the purport of the Bill? I rose more particularly to call the attention of the minister to the fact that it will not be satisfactory if he makes this explanation on Monday, and then endeavours to force the educational clauses through at the same sitting, the country having had no opportunity to learn what his explanation has been or to exercise any judgment upon the Bill before it is disposed of.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not always do me the honour to listen to what I say—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say that that has all been arranged.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) leader is satisfied, and we have had this tempest in the tea-pot for nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware of the fact. Had I known it, I should have been relieved of the necessity of speaking at any length.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman should have inquired of his leader.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has made a mistake. He said he rose to reply to some observation that I made—

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not worth while.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I think it is quite worth while. I referred to the fact that an explanation was needed—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) a question?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question is this: Why does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) consider it necessary to continue this process of obstruction and prevent the Minister of Justice going on with clause 2?

Mr. PATERSON. I have no desire to do that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the hon. gentleman is doing it, just the same.

Mr. PATERSON. Evidently, hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to proceed, and I thought we might just as well have a hand in.

Mr. SPROULE. I will tell the hon. gentleman why I did not reply—

Mr. PATERSON. I want to make another remark. I can understand that hon. gentlemen opposite, from a party point of view, owing to local condition and the popularity of the Minister of the Interior (Mr.