

the trustees so desire, may be opened with the Lord's prayer; distribution of the legislative grant to all schools according to educational efficiency on principles set out in chapter 31.

Then, where there is a public school, the minority, Protestant or Roman Catholic, may organize a separate school; but every separate school is subject absolutely to all the foregoing provisions, and is in every sense of the term a public school. If the Protestants are in the minority in a district, their school is called a separate school; if the Catholics are in the minority in a district, their school is called a separate school; but both are public schools. They are absolutely similar save for one distinction: where the trustees are Protestant, there is Protestant teaching from half-past three to four, and where the trustees are Roman Catholic there is Roman Catholic teaching from half-past three to four. That is absolutely the only distinction between these schools.

What does that preserve? I have read these ordinances through, and all that I can find this section to preserve—and it is an important thing—let us not exaggerate or minimize, let us know exactly what we are doing—I think that this is what we are doing and all that we are doing. This section preserves the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority to have their school, a separate school in name, but a public school in fact, in a separate building if they wish. That is the right it preserves. It preserves, secondly, the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in such school to have religious teaching from 3.30 to 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

But there cannot be under this system any control of the school by any clerical or sectarian body. There cannot be any sectarian teaching between nine o'clock in the morning and half-past three in the afternoon. So that, so far as we have objections to separate schools based upon the idea of church control, clerical control, or ecclesiasticism in any form, this system of schools is certainly not open to that objection.

Mr. BERGERON. Who said that?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) when he recanted and came back with a promise of being sent to England as High Commissioner or getting back his old job.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Has he got it?

Mr. TAYLOR. He will get it. I prophesy that he will go to England or back to his old job as soon as the session is over. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a proposition to the Minister of Justice which I shall ask the Minister of Finance to convey to him as he is not in his place. I suggest to the Minister of Justice that if the statements of the Minister of Finance and the ex-Minister of the Interior are true, he should let the lawyers on both sides of the House get together and frame an amendment in accordance with the statements of these two gentlemen, an amendment which shall contain nothing more, but which shall be put in plain language so that the man on the street may know what it means. Then, so far as I am concerned,

156½

there will be no opposition because it is a national school as both of these hon. gentlemen say, a national school with only one half hour's religious teaching between 3.30 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. And I am sure the people of the Northwest or of Ontario, or of any other section of the Dominion will raise no objection to that. It is because as the ex-Minister of the Interior says, the draughtsman who drew the original clause and the amendment put a good deal more in it than appears on the face of it that my challenge has not been accepted. The Minister of Finance, although he has made that statement and although it has been published to the world for electioneering purposes, knows in his inmost heart that the amendment as it has been interpreted since he spoke means a good deal more than that half hour.

Mr. FIELDING. Tell us what?

Mr. TAYLOR. What does it do with the money from the school lands? How is that apportioned, will the minister explain?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reference to it at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read the law of 1875 which is not repealed.

Mr. FIELDING. Tell us what the difference is.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have given my hon. friend one statement and he has not risen to contradict it.

Mr. FIELDING. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I stated I could not give the explanation about it, because it is not there.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not the Act to quote the amendment or I would give it.

Mr. FIELDING. In the clause as it now stands there is no reference to the school lands. There is a reference to the distribution of public moneys, but my hon. friend did not ask about that, he asked about school lands.

Mr. TAYLOR. School lands fund, I said, and they are part of the public money.

Mr. SPROULE. Where do the school funds come from but from the school lands?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend's question was about school lands.

Mr. TAYLOR. The funds from the school lands; they cannot apportion the lands.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no change in the law about that.

Mr. TAYLOR. But my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) in his speech did not say a word about it.

Mr. FIELDING. I told you that there was no change in the law about it. It is