

could not be moved except in committee. The hon. gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. SPROULE. I know the rules very well. And I know that in an important Bill like this, when an amendment is to be proposed by the government, as announced by ministers of the Crown, which materially alters the Bill, it is the duty of the government to make an explanation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It changes the section not the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. It changes the section of the Bill—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is more accurate.

Mr. SPROULE. The great question in this Bill was the educational clause—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In my hon. friends (Mr. Sproule's) mind—not in that of anybody else.

Mr. SPROULE. It was on these sections that the greatest time was spent in the discussion of the second reading. If the government propose to change these educational clauses, they change the whole effect of the measure. Yet they desire to keep it from the House and the country, allowing hon. members and the people at large to be misled. If they say that it was never intended that the provision of the original Bill should be enacted, then what was intended? We should know the facts that we may be able to bring our judgment to bear upon the Bill as it is proposed to be, and to decide whether in our opinion it will be acceptable to the country and to the new provinces or not. Whether the Minister of Justice agrees with me or not, I say that common sense demands that the explanation of the main feature of the Bill should have been given in the discussion on the second reading. Take, for instance, the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell). His constituents wrote asking what the Bill meant. It was as plain as day to that hon. member and he told them what it meant. Yet, the provisions of the Bill as it was then before us would not at all carry out what the hon. gentleman said was the intention of the Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Wouldn't it?

Mr. SPROULE. No. I say that distinctly. What did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) say it meant? Did he say it meant separate schools? No, he said it meant public and national schools, the only difference being that, where desired, half an hour would be allowed at the end of the day for religious instruction. And he went on to explain that, although the original Act of 1875 might have meant separate schools, might have meant church schools, might have meant confessional schools that was not what the Bill meant at all. And

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

the members from the Northwest knew that that was not what it meant. And the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) declared that the amended clauses would not allow church schools. Yet, the Minister of Justice told us, no longer ago than last night:

In my judgment, section 93—

Which this would bring in.

—would bring in all the rights and privileges which exist in favour of denominational schools in the Territories at the present time or at the 1st of July coming. Those rights and privileges would include all those rights which are covered by section 11 of the Act of 1875.

The Minister of Justice thus declares that it would include all the rights, yet the ex-Minister of the Interior says it practically would not include any of the rights, but would take away the right to separate schools and make practically one system of public and national schools, taking them from under the control of the church organizations that wish to carry on separate schools. That is what it is going to accomplish according to the hon. minister from Centre York (Mr. Campbell).

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Is he a minister?

Mr. SPROULE. Prospective minister. If that is what it will accomplish, the Minister of Justice should tell us so. We discussed for a whole month the second reading of the Bill, and yet we are left in the dark as to what the Bill is to be. I say that is treating parliament with very scant courtesy, it is treating parliament with—I was almost going to say, contempt. We are not given the explanation this House was entitled to ask before disposing of the second reading. It is treating parliament with contempt, I say, to leave it in the dark for such a length of time upon so important a matter. And now we are told the Minister of Justice is not ready to give an explanation because he has not his papers with him. For my part I am disposed to give him every opportunity to make his explanation. But, if the minister cannot explain, I feel like calling upon the hon. member of Centre York (Mr. Campbell) because he has explained all to his constituents, he has explained it even to the ministers of the Gospel in this constituency. He ought to explain it to the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has not explained it yet.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) give us his explanation?

Mr. SPROULE. I have given my views with regard to the course that should be taken. But I am denied the benefit of the knowledge and wisdom of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice as to what the Bill is to be. It is desirable that we should have that information, for it