

no difference between the public schools of that country and the separate schools. Well there seems to be a difference according to the gentleman who spoke last night, a slight difference at least. The hon. member (Mr. Scott) found a good deal of fault with the headlines that are published in some newspapers in Ontario. For instance :

A free west, a common school, provincial rights and religious equality.

He did not seem to think that was a good thing to publish in any part of this country. I think they are sentiments that even he might endorse although he may support this Bill, if he does I am of opinion that he will not be voting for all these sentiments. He seems to differ with me. He says :

Articles and inflammatory cartoons under that motto have led the innocent citizens to believe that the proposals of the government are entirely in the teeth of this motto. I say that every item proposed by the government is in strict observance of these principles. . . . . A common school—that is just what we are asked to vote for in this proposition ; a non-sectarian school, absolutely under state control. A free west—that is a reasonably free west ; just as free as Ontario.

Now, if it is no freer than Ontario, it has to have separate schools, because by the constitution which we have we are bound to maintain separate schools, but we do not maintain them in every part of the country. I am proud to say that I live in a town where we do not have any separate schools. We had a separate school a good many years ago, but the people got tired of it, and away back in 1875, before the law compelled us to put a Roman Catholic on the high school board, by common consent the town council, of which I had the honour of being a member, asked the Roman Catholics to name a man to represent them on the high school board. He was put on, and I think he has been a member of the school board ever since. We employ a certain number of Roman Catholic teachers in our schools, and we have had no trouble whatever, we have lived in peace and harmony, which is the kind of thing I would like to see all over this country. I think when our boys and girls grow up and attend school together, they come to know one another, and they forget for the time being what particular sect each one may belong to. They grow up to respect one another, and to live together as Christian people ought to live, in my judgment. A free common school under state control is what my hon. friend calls it. Then the hon. member for Beauharnois asked the question :

Mr. BERGERON. What is the difference between the two schools then ?

Mr. SCOTT. Not any difference, only the one I have mentioned.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the separate school then ?

Mr. U. WILSON.

Mr. SCOTT. It is certainly a separate school, though it is not a religious school.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be in a different building, but it is the same school.

Mr. SCOTT. It is the same class of school.

Now the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) spoke last night, and he said :

The only difference is that in the first and second readers the text is a little different, but even these books have to be authorized by the Minister of Education. There is no church or clerical control in any shape, form or manner over the Catholic schools in the Northwest Territories to-day.

Now we have one gentleman saying there is no difference whatever, and another gentleman admitting that there is a difference in the two first books that the children use. And there may be others. Then the hon. gentleman quoted some things, and I have not been able to understand why he quoted them, unless it was to obtain the good opinion of his leader ; because there is a vacancy in the cabinet, we have no Minister of the Interior at the present time, and as a matter of course they will have to take a man from the west. I do not object to the hon. gentleman if he can get the position, but I fear he will have a good deal of trouble in getting elected. Now he said :

I have a communication from an important body, the Baptist convention of Manitoba and the Territories, the third clause of which is as follows :

This is a scheme which will promote discord and defeat one of the main purposes of public school education, which is the unification of all classes. A confederation cannot be sound in which the elements lack the first essential of harmony.

Now, why he should quote that communication as a reason for voting for the Bill, I cannot understand, because if I had a communication like that sent to me I would think that they wanted me to vote the other way. But I noticed that after he got through his leader went up and shook hands with him, and I wondered whether it was on account of the amount of scrap book material he used, or on account of his independence of the people he represented. Again he said :

Another petition very largely signed contains the following :

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully urge you to use all influence you may have against the separate school clause in the Bill now before parliament.

That is another reason why he should vote for that Bill.

In a petition dated March 7th, from the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, the second clause reads as follows :

Whereas the rights of the minority are sufficiently protected by the British North America Act in any particular case.