

fellow-citizens? I am ready to do it, always have been ready to do it. I am ready to have my children associate, both at school and at play, as they do associate with the children of my fellow-citizens, belong they to what church they may. Is that intolerance? Is that a lack of forbearance? Is it not rather the endeavour to meet on one common plain and one common platform all the various faiths and religious denominations that compose this great country? The model school system of the Northwest, as it has been held out, and as I believe it is, is one that possibly will be continued. The amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition does not say that separate schools may not exist there. It proposes to give full freedom of action to those provinces to establish just such schools as they want. It may be, indeed, that the difference between the two classes of schools will be greater than the Minister of Finance admitted; but we are going to trust those people—that is the policy—to do what they in their judgment, and in the best interests of the territory committed to their hands, see to be just and right and true. Is there any intolerance there, any lack of forbearance there, anything that would trammel the action of those two great provinces? Our friends opposite, notably the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) evinced a very sudden liking for the British system of education. That was surely a strange position, for the hon. gentleman is usually anti-imperialist in every respect. Whenever we wish to draw the ties closer, the hon. member for Labelle refuses, and says, we do not wish to come any closer. But he develops suddenly a very great liking for British institutions, and on a matter that is very poorly chosen, and which, of all others, has led to more friction and is at present causing more heartburnings than have been experienced in the British Islands in a generation. And yet the hon. member for Labelle tells us that the British system is what he would imitate. I have always looked upon the hon. member for Labelle as the Henry Labouchere of this House. When anything imperial is proposed in the British House, Mr. Labouchere opposes it; and I have always looked upon the hon. member for Labelle as the counterpart in this House of Mr. Labouchere in the British House, because he is always opposed to anything imperial. On the educational question, Mr. Labouchere has a record. I had the pleasure of sitting in the British House when a fierce and acrimonious debate took place on this very question, in which Mr. Labouchere made light of the very system that the hon. member for Labelle admires. Lord Hugh Cecil had held the attention of the House while he argued that religious instruction should be given in the schools of

Great Britain, and spoke of the desirability of training the young in the way they should go, and keeping them out of the way of the evil one who went about seeking whom he might devour; and Mr. Labouchere, not in the House, it is true, but in his paper, ridiculed the idea and hit it off in these words:

Oh, strait is the way to the panther's den,  
And wide is the panther's throat,  
And the kid that is caught in the narrow way  
Is saved from the sin of the verb to stray  
And the trouble of being a goat.

That is the way Mr. Labouchere hit off the religious aspirations of Lord Hugh Cecil when he was asked those very things which the hon. member for Labelle said he would like to see introduced into this country—denominational schools. The system of denominational schools, as it exists in Great Britain to-day, is a system which, with all due regard to British intelligence and British sense of right and justice, is a system which never can be successfully introduced into a young country like this. Consider the figures I read to you from the census; and I have other figures with reference to the new territory now being set apart, which are almost identical with the figures I gave respecting the whole of Canada. The Roman Catholics are the principal body, even in the new territories, in point of numbers. They beat the Methodists, the Presbyterians and the Anglicans, all of which come pretty close. If that is the case, how are we going to introduce into that country denominational schools? It is an impossibility. Both the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs entered a plea for that system. It sounds very well; it is pleasing; but what I submit to this House, and what this country knows, is that it is impracticable. The First Minister tells us that the divisions are small between us. They may be small, but up to the present they have been insuperable, and we are to-day divided into fifty or sixty sects in this country; and although we are all put together, sixty per cent of the population, to fight and scrap and settle our differences, how are we going to introduce any system of denominational schools into this country and carry it to a successful issue? We cannot do it. The authorities of the various Protestant churches have never carried out, and are not to-day in the province of Ontario carrying out, what the hon. member for Labelle and the hon. Solicitor General recommended to the consideration of this House.

That cannot be done. The introduction of denominational schools into this country is not practicable. There are too many differences among us, and all we can do for, the present at least, is provide for the inculcation of Christian ethics into the youth of our country. Let those essentials of Christian religion to which all agree, to

Mr. COCKSHUTT.