

have consciences. I do not know whether the First Minister applies that to parliament. Well, Sir, if the Bill passes, while the law may be general, the separate school provisions will apply only to minorities. Look at section 41 of ordinance 29, and if I am wrong I ask the Minister of Justice to correct me. You cannot bring a separate school into existence under section 41 of that ordinance unless the minority moves. There can be no separate school without that. Well, then, what about conscientious scruples against being taught in the public schools under the law as now proposed by the right hon. the First Minister? Suppose for instance, there should be in a district, twenty-five Roman Catholics and ten Methodists, the minority can have a separate school. The majority must have a public school, separate and apart from every separate school, and yet, Sir, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) yesterday said that there could be remedial legislation if the majority were not satisfied. Will my hon. friend the Minister of Justice inform this House where there can be in that case remedial legislation? The Minister of Inland Revenue was interrupted by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and I am bound to say that I think that hon. gentleman got the better of the argument. Of course it might be possible—nay, quite probable—that there would be occasions in which these great western provinces, when conditions that I have named might actually arise, yet the right hon. gentleman makes no provision for any such conditions.

There is just another question or two I would like to ask the Minister of Justice. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) flung a very undisguised sneer at the draftsman of clause 16 of the Bill as originally introduced. On a former occasion and today the Minister of Justice, in a very meek and penitential way, admitted that he was the draftsman. I think, Sir, it is now due from the member for Brandon to make an apology to the Minister of Justice for the manner in which he referred to the draftsman upon that occasion. But, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be in a somewhat inquisitive mood to-night, and I would like to know who was the draftsman of the proposed amendment to section 16? It was drawn by no 'prentice hand. Was it the Minister of Justice who was the draftsman? The hon. gentleman, I notice, this afternoon took particular care to steer clear of that inquiry. Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) were satisfied at all events with the amendment that was drawn. In consequence of that amendment they withdrew their opposition to the Bill; and when they gave us their reasons why they had withdrawn their opposition and were now in hearty support of the proposals of the right hon. the First Minister, they said: Why,

this amounts to nothing; this is only a little question of religious instruction from half-past three to four o'clock in the afternoon. And if you would believe the statements of those hon. gentlemen, you would think that this system of separate schools was a somewhat weak, attenuated thing, and that you would require a microscope to detect the first germs of the separate school principle in it. If that be true, then what crushing force in the argument of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron)? Is it possible that the government is pretending to give something when it is giving nothing? Now, I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Justice what, in his opinion, is the difference?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman really wants an answer, if he will apply his logical mind to this debate, he will admit that the time to explain that will be when the amendment is before the House.

Mr. STOCKTON. There must have been some explanation to the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to induce them to come back to the fold. The hon. the Minister of Justice did not wait, in their case, to make an explanation, and in making the explanation to get the support of the Liberal members of the west. I say it is due to this House, before we vote upon the second reading, that we should have an explanation from the first law officer of the Crown.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then the hon. member had better not vote on the second reading in that case.

Mr. STOCKTON. I want to say to my hon. friend that I am not voting on his recommendation. I want to say that I am voting against both propositions, and therefore it is not necessary to give that explanation in that respect; but it is due, not only to the House, but to the country, that the public should know what the government, at all events, consider is the difference between these two proposals. But the Minister of Justice either does not think there is any—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. STOCKTON. Or he will not tell—one thing or the other.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman is so well qualified that he has proved he can tell the difference himself.

Mr. STOCKTON. We may both be qualified to understand that ourselves, but there may be others who may not be qualified, and who are not lawyers, and we want to know from the hon. minister what the difference is. If he explains what he truly believes is the difference, as a lawyer, he would shake the confidence of the men behind him.