

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish to burden the returns too much, but could we have the same information with regard to the schools for each electoral division?

Mr. OLIVER. That is not available here; it is to be procured at Regina. Of course, we could try to get it. We would wire and might get the information by Monday. Of course, we have no authority over those people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it available there in the form of returns?

Mr. OLIVER. In the records of the Educational Department. There would be no records, I suppose, showing the number of schools by electoral districts, but by taking a map they might be able to work it out for our information. It would take time and it would impose upon them labour which we have no right to demand. But I am willing to ask for it.

Mr. LAKE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) get the same information for the towns in Saskatchewan? It will save time.

Mr. OLIVER. At the request of the leader of the opposition I am going to put in hand the information with regard to Saskatchewan that has been asked for in regard to Alberta.

Mr. BARKER. The minister said there was a much larger number of schools in one part of the country than in the other. Could he say whether in the case of the larger number these were general schools? For instance, were they Galician or Doukhobor schools, or were they all general schools, as I believe they are in the south?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. All public schools except two Roman Catholic schools in my constituency.

Mr. BARKER. Are there no separate schools of the foreign races?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. No, we have none of those.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the figures with regard to schools give us the number of pupils attending or the number enrolled?

Mr. OLIVER. That was read last night.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I can give the abstract of that now. According to the information received yesterday it would appear that there are north of township 38, 8,834 on the school rolls, and to the south, 8,553. There are in Edmonton 1,330 children and in Calgary 1,593 on the rolls.

Mr. LAKE. Are Edmonton and Calgary in addition to the other figures, or are they included in the other figures?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Edmonton is included in the number of school children in the north and Calgary in the south. I gave the special figures for these two because they were contained in the telegram.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. INGRAM. And Red Deer also, 333.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do these include the Indian schools?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That does not include the Indian schools; the Indian schools are not under the control of the local authorities: these are the schools organized under the school ordinances of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. INGRAM. This does not include the Indian children?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Indian children come under the Indian Department.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON moved that the following Bills from the Senate be placed on the order paper for second reading.

Bill (No. 177) respecting certain patents of David Thomas Owen.

Bill (No. 178) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.

Bill (No. 179) respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

Bill (No. 182) respecting the Sterling Bank of Canada.

Bill (No. 183) respecting a certain patent of the Metal Volatilization Company; and

Bill (No. 185) for the relief of Isaac Pitblado.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is the same motion that was declared out of order today, is it not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am informed it is now in order. The motion has been prepared by the clerk of the House in accordance with the rules.

Mr. INGRAM. Is Bill (No. 177) not the one we had before the Banking and Commerce Committee? It is the number, but it does not seem to be the same Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand these Bills were read a first time in due course and referred to the Standing Orders Committee. This is simply to put them in proper order for the second reading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When they are read a first time, why do you require a motion to put them on the paper?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. It is because there is no regulation providing that a Bill read the first time and referred to the Standing Orders Committee can be placed on the order paper for second reading, because there is no order of the House to that effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is as to Bills that come from the Senate.