

was given what in my opinion, was a very valuable expression of opinion on this question. This was given by Dr. James A. Carmichael, one of the superintendents of Presbyterian Home Missions in Western Canada. And here is a sentence from what Dr. Carmichael said :

The half hour of the day in which religious instruction may be given had been a provision, Dr. Carmichael explained, not demanded by any hierarchy, but suggested and incorporated in the Bill by an inspector of schools who was an elder of the Presbyterian church.

Now, Dr. Carmichael was speaking of something he was fully acquainted with. He had lived in Regina for a dozen years—was the pastor of the Presbyterian Church there. The inspector referred to was one of the members of his congregation. And, when it was made plain to the members from the Northwest Territories supporting the government that section 16, No. 2, would not guarantee in regard to religious instruction, exactly and entirely what we have at the present time, we said we would have to insist upon an amendment. What we said in January before the Bill was brought down we repeated in February after the Bill was before us, and when we recognized that the government had failed in carrying out our suggestion that the existing condition should be perpetuated exactly and entirely, we decided to ask for a further amendment. And I think the committee will agree that if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) is adopted we shall have obtained exactly what the seven men from the Northwest Territories supporting the government suggested in the first place—that, so far as separate schools and religious instruction are concerned we should have guaranteed exactly what we have under existing ordinances.

Mr. SPROULE. But in London and Oxford the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) declared that section 16 was absolute perfection.

Mr. SCOTT. Did my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) hear anything that I said in Oxford? I never saw him there.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that the less the hon. gentlemen opposite say about Oxford the better for themselves. We know that North Oxford reduced their majority about twelve hundred in the last election, showing conclusively that many of their own friends there have no confidence in the educational clauses of this Bill. And Braemar reduced the Liberal majority to 75. Why was it not 125? Why, you could scarcely find a Conservative in Braemar. I had the honour to go there, and we had to get a Liberal for a chairman—and he made a very good chairman indeed. I talked to those people and I flatter myself that I had made a very good impression and that I was amongst those who succeeded in bringing down that majority to 75. I think hon. gen-

Mr. SCOTT.

tiemen opposite have got all they want from Braemar. And Zorra. Why Zorra never gave so large a Conservative vote in its history as on this occasion. Zorra and Braemar have spooked in no uncertain tones, and I think in a way not very satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite. I was called out of the House for a short time, and have not heard all of this discussion. I would like to deal with this amendment from my own standpoint. And by the way, I would be obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lamont) who moved it if he would kindly send me a copy of the amendment.

An hon. MEMBER. Here it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to get a copy from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lamont) himself. No doubt he has many copies. Did he not supply his friends with copies? Or are they taking it for granted? Surely the government would not propose to put an amendment through the House in this secret, clandestine way, without even allowing members an opportunity to read it. We have heard a good deal about restricting the rights of the people of the Northwest. But has it come to this, that the government are going to restrict the House of Commons and not allow hon. members an opportunity to read an amendment that is proposed in this committee? Now, we have been talking for a long time on this question. And I confess that I am somewhat surprised that at this late hour of the day and of the session we have another resolution proposing to put further restrictions upon these new provinces. I believe that the British North America Act gives to these provinces the exclusive power to make laws in relation to education. We may talk by the hour, but we cannot get over that fact—that the British North America Act gives to these provinces the exclusive power to legislate in relation to education.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is absolutely wrong.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman was all wrong at Zorra, he was wrong in Braemar, he is wrong all the time, I am speaking of the British North America Act, there is no uncertainty about that, it is not a 'Globe' report. The British North America Act, says that the provinces shall have the exclusive right to make laws in relation to education.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. It says nothing of the kind.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman challenge the correctness of the British North America Act? I do not believe the hon. gentleman ever read it, unless he read it by proxy, as he votes by proxy.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I challenge the hon. gentleman to read it now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have it in my head as well as in this book, and it states that