

and thirty religions represented in the Northwest Territories. Are we to have that many kinds of schools there? And, if not, is not the only logical course to take the control of education of the rising generation away from the church—

Mr. LEMIEUX. What church?

Mr. SPROULE. That is the question I asked. This Bill proposes to hand it over to one church. My contention is that no church should be allowed to control it. In my opinion it is as improper to give the control of education to the Methodist church or the Presbyterian or the Baptist or the Lutheran or the Mormon as it would be to give it to the Catholic Church—they are all in the same category according to my judgment. The state should provide the means of education and should control education. We should have a state system of education as we have in some parts of the Dominion to-day.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) tell us what is the difference between the schools that are proposed to be established in the Northwest Territories and that he calls separate schools on the one hand, and the public schools on the other hand?

Mr. SPROULE. That is not relevant to the purposes of my argument. I am not saying anything about the quality of the schools as they are to-day, but I am talking about the interference with the powers of the provincial legislature, to give whatever system of schools they think best. Now we can find some countries where this particular school system does prevail. Where does it prevail?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. In Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. You have there what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) would call a national system. But the peculiar system to which I have referred is used in Newfoundland. Every denomination has its own schools and the public money devoted to education is divided amongst them. And I have a letter from a very intelligent gentleman there, who says: God forbid that you should drift into the educational methods that we have here.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. What is his name?

Mr. SPROULE. He is a Scotchman like the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston), but he does not come from South Cape Breton, and his name is not Johnston. He tells me that the public money devoted to education is divided amongst these denominations, and he adds: Our educational system is a disgrace to the civilization of the twentieth century. Are we desirous of going back to that condition in the Northwest Territories? Yet, it is the only logical thing we can do

Mr. SPROULE.

if we follow out the principles of this Bill. The separation of church and state is one of the principles that we fought for long ago. Are we desirous of throwing away to-day all that we have gained in this respect? I say that this Bill which is a violation of that principle, it is a re-union of the church and the state by which education will be handed over to church control.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) tell me how these separate schools of the Northwest will be under the control of the church and not under the control of the state?

Mr. SPROULE. The minister refers to a condition of things different from the ordinary separate schools. He has always been defending the system in Quebec and Ontario. I am speaking of the system in Quebec and Ontario where schools are under the control of the church. Does the hon. gentleman deny that in his own province?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am speaking of the system existing in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking of the desire to perpetuate a system which will practically put the control of the schools under the church, where the money for the support of those schools must go to the church indirectly. Then this is a union of church and state.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will admit that so far as the Northwest is concerned, there is no provision in the Bill now before the House by which the schools shall be under the control of the church.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not say that the church has any improper control over them in the Northwest. I am talking about the principle involved in taking away from the provinces the right of control, and compelling them to establish a system they do not want. Remember I am not condemning the educational system there to-day, nor am I fighting to do away with that system; I am fighting for the right of the provinces to establish whatever system they choose.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Did not my hon. friend say a moment ago that the system of separate schools was bad?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, the system that we have in Ontario and Quebec is bad.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The national system is better—that is the way to put it.

Mr. SPROULE. Now if the legislatures of those provinces, in the exercise of their undoubted right, see fit to establish separate schools to-morrow, I have not a word of objection to it. It is their own business, their own right. We are not fighting