e; and

found

he Pro-

vote

stant

date,

the

tion

ant

this

the

the

yet

m-

lls

ch

00

n,

of

municipal constables, have never been taken seriously, Then, Mr. Speaker, has the principle of compulsory school attendance been passed upon and approved of by the electorate of this province? Is there a single member of this House, except perhaps the member for St Louis, who submitted this question to the electors at the last or at any previous general election?

## NOT A QUESTION OF RELIGION.

In the course of his remarks, the member for St. Louis observed that the question under consideration is not one of religion. I agree with him on this head. But it is precisely because it is not a question of religiou that there is no reason why we should create a distinction between those who practise the Catholic faith and those who do not, and why I maintain that the distinction established by this bill is repugnant to reason, cannot be supported and should not be introduced into our legislation. If we are ready to cnact a regime of coercion we should do so for all; otherwise we would not be law-makers worthy of the name. For it is not as Catholics or as Protestants that parents should send their children to school, but as fathers and as such alone can they be compelled to have them educated.

I formerly voted for a bill authorizing the cremation of bodies in this province, but the question was