

wants to provide that there will be religious teaching in the schools from 3.30 to 4 o'clock.

Mr. LAMONT. Permission to have it if the trustees desire it.

Mr. INGRAM. I was coming to that; that is, if the trustees see fit they can continue the religious teaching in any school. If it is to be left to the trustees, what objection can there be to allowing the local legislature to control that matter; and if the school trustees desire to have religious teaching, well and good; and if they do not, well and good; the majority would rule in that case. As I understand, the hon. gentleman says that religious teaching will not be continued unless he has embodied in section 16 the amendment which he has just moved, and I understood the First Minister to say that the principle of separate schools is being perpetuated, but not the principle of religious teaching. The religious teaching for the half hour can be changed. That is what I understood the right hon. gentleman to say; but just lately, before the Minister of Justice sat down, I understood him to say they were going to perpetuate religious teaching. I may be wrong, but that is my understanding.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No; the right to religious teaching.

Mr. INGRAM. What we intend to do is to carry out what my hon. friend has in mind, to allow this question of religious teaching to be a matter controlled by the trustees.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And to prevent the provinces dealing with that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And that the trustees, representing the ratepayers, shall have the power and the right to determine whether or not there shall be religious teaching.

Mr. INGRAM. So that instead of the local legislature having any control whatever of the privileges, we fasten this on the trustees for all time to come.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We do not fasten it; we give them the right.

Mr. INGRAM. What I say now is that the province cannot change that. I am going to end up in York again. My hon. friend from York said that the local legislature could change and I am glad to know I have the opinion of the Minister of Justice on this, he says they cannot. On the other hand, I have this to say that the Northwest representatives, sitting here on the government side, are in favour of perpetuating separate schools in the Territories. I am perfectly satisfied. That places me in this position. I am opposed to any interference by this government in the matter of perpetuating separate schools, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, in the Territories. I am in favour of the new provinces having

Mr. INGRAM.

entire control of their educational affairs; and when any supporter of the government, at any future time, undertakes to say that the local legislatures of the new provinces have the right to interfere with religious teaching in the public schools, he is not making a statement in accord with that made by the Minister of Justice and the leader of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. The whole thing is an attack upon the public school system of the country. Step by step we are interfering with that principle which we have admired so much and which has been constantly built up by accretion during the last fifty years, and which was started in Ontario by Egerton Ryerson many years ago. We are providing that the school board, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, can have such religious instruction in the public schools as they desire.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Who says no? I say if this amendment carries, the school board, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, will provide for religious instruction in the public schools according to the views of the trustees. You are taking a public school, which ought to be a school that Catholics and Protestants alike may attend, without having to listen to any instruction in any dogma which they do not profess, and you are giving to the trustees of that school the right to insist on religious instruction being given and the dogmas they favour being taught.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are not introducing anything new. What we are introducing has been in existence at least twenty years. The very condition of things to which my hon. friend objects, the possibility of having religious instruction in the public schools, has existed in the Territories since 1885. No injustice has been done to anybody under that system. If my hon. friend wants evidence of that, let him ask the representatives of the Territories who sit on this side. They will tell him that they are satisfied with this condition of things, and that it has worked no injury to anybody.

Mr. SPROULE. What I was endeavouring to say was that when the educational clause No. 2 was submitted, the hon. members for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) declared that, to all intents and purposes, it left the public school a school in which no person had any right to say what religious instruction ought to be given in it. But the government are now doing, through one of their own stool pigeons, what they dare not do of their own motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The term used is not parliamentary.

Mr. SPROULE. If so I am quite willing to take it back, but I cannot find any other