

principle of this Bill. But when we ask the government, who are charged with the preparation of this Bill, what the Bill is actually proposed to be, we are told the nature of certain parts of the Bill. With regard to another portion of the Bill, that amendments are to be made, these amendments may entirely change the educational principles of the Bill. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) tells us that the proposed amendment will entirely change the principle of the Bill, and so, while he dissented upon the principle of clause 16 as originally proposed, he supported it because he is told that an amendment is to be proposed which entirely changes it. Then we find the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot), and others who have spoken upon this Bill, declared that it does not contain the principle of separate schools and therefore is satisfactory to their people and they will support it. They admit that if this Bill contained the principle of separate schools as the Manitoba School Act contained it, they would not support it. Now, it either contains that principle or it does not. In my judgment the only question before the House was the question of clause 2 and clause 16, which did give separate schools as fully and comprehensively as the separate schools in Quebec or Ontario. On the strength of these clauses as first proposed, the people of the province of Quebec sent in 65 petitions in support of the Bill. Would they have sent those petitions if the Bill had not contained the principle of separate schools? Did the hon. gentlemen who voted for the Bill, vote for the principle of separate schools as they exist in the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario, or did they not? The member for Colchester (Mr. Laurence) declares that they do not contain that principle, and so his people are satisfied, and he fails to find a single individual who was dissatisfied. And he declares that the voice of opposition to the Bill which is heard from the west is due to misapprehension of the real provisions of the Bill. But when the Bill was explained, how was it explained?

It was explained in two ways, first by sending copies of the Bill to the people in that western country, who examined it as best they could on their own judgment, and they reached the conclusion that the Bill contained the elements of separate schools as they are found in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario; and because they found that principle in it, they pronounced against it by sending in memorials, resolutions and petitions opposing it. If they have been misled, who misled them? Was it not the government? If they have been misled, and that is not really the principle of the Bill, why do the government refuse to enlighten

them, to enlighten this House, in order that the country may be enlightened, by explaining what the provisions of the Bill will be when the new clauses are introduced which they intend to propose. Is that doing justice to the House and to the country? The people of that western country desire and are entitled to be enlightened, but the Minister of Justice refuses to enlighten them and this House, and I say that the members of this House who voted for the second reading of that Bill voted on clause 16 and clause 2, which the minister declares were intended to give to the people of that western country separate schools in the very highest interpretation of that word, separate schools that might fairly be regarded as confessional schools, as church schools, such as they have in Quebec. He says that was his intention. He said that he desired to leave no misapprehension in the people's mind and not leave any loophole to crawl out of as they did in Manitoba, on account of the defect in the law there. He desired to do that, and that is the character of the Bill for which hon. members voted. Let me ask the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), who says he is as much opposed to separate schools as any member in this House, what he voted on when he voted for this Bill? Let me ask, on behalf of the people, did he vote on the clauses now before the House or on the principle of the Bill before the House, for the Minister of Justice declares that the principle of that Bill is separate schools to the fullest extent? Let me ask the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. T. Martin) what he voted on, when he declared that he is opposed to the principle of separate schools? He defended his vote, and declared he was in favour of the principle of this Bill and voted for the principle of this Bill, and let me ask the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) what he voted for when he voted on this Bill after his return from the west? Was it on the Bill before the House or not? The proposed amendments were not before the House, and therefore he could not vote for what was not before the House. He declared they had in the west, not separate schools, but national public schools, and he was voting for national separate schools in the Bill, church schools, confessional schools, which the Minister of Justice declares he intends the Bill to provide. I ask are all these people in the west to be misled? What about the member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell)? What did he vote on? Did he vote in favour of the Bill as it is, or on some other question? I would like to ask him what he voted on?

Mr. BENNETT. Ask him something easy.

Mr. SPROULE. Ask him something easy! Here is a letter regarding a petition that was sent to him from Markham, and the gentleman who sends it to me