

where by law the liquor traffic should be prohibited. He hoped the Government would consent to strike out this provision.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL hoped the Government would strike it out. If this clause remained he trusted no gentleman who had the cause of prohibition at heart would ever consent to accept office in that country. (Laughter.)

The subject then dropped on the understanding that the amendment should be moved on the third reading.

The bill was then reported without amendment.

EDUCATION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

On the motion for the third reading,

HON. MR. AIKINS stated he was opposed to a provision in this bill. In the 11th clause provision was made for the maintenance of certain schools for Protestants and Roman Catholics separately. He thought it was unwise to introduce anything of this nature into the bill. He therefore moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. FLINT, to strike out all the words after "therefor" in the 12th line.

HON. MR. BROWN thought this provision was quite contrary to the British North America Act. Nothing was more clear than that each Province should have absolute control over education. He thought that was the only principle on which this Union Act could continue. If the Dominion Government interfered with local matters we would get into inextricable confusion with the Provinces. The safe way for us was to let each Province suit itself in such matters. This country was filled by people of all classes and creeds, and there would be no end of confusion if each class had to have its own peculiar school system. It had been said this clause was put in for the protection of the Protestants against the Catholics, the latter being the most numerous. But he, speaking for the Protestants, was in a position to say that we did not want that protection. In this case it was proposed that the national machinery should be used for the imposition and collection of taxes upon persons of peculiar denominations for the support of schools of their kind. It was an

attempt to enforce upon that country peculiar views with regard to education.

HON. MR. SCOTT was very sorry the hon. gentleman had brought the subject up. But he thought no one could read the history of Canada for the last ten years without seeing that this Government had done a wise thing in removing from that new country a cause of discord which had been a thorn in the side of every Government that had existed. Any gentleman would have to admit that it was the greatest possible relief to the people of Ontario that this question was settled for them, and was not, as in some of the other Provinces, a source of constant discord. He was one of those who maintained that parents had a right to educate their children as they pleased, and that they ought not to be taxed to maintain schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. Our whole system of Government was based upon that sound principle, and how long could we have happiness and peace in this country if we were to abolish that safeguard which was now recognized in both the large Provinces? Would not every gentleman in this chamber gladly see the New Brunswick trouble removed? Now was the proper time to establish in the new territory a principle that ought years ago have been established in this Dominion. He hoped hon. gentlemen would not take advantage of their majority to force upon the House a principle to which many were conscientiously opposed to.

HON. MR. MILLER did not agree with the construction placed on the Act of Union by the hon. member from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Brown), in regard to the subject under discussion. He contended that the exclusive right to deal with the subject of education given to the Provincial Legislatures was intended to apply to the old Provinces, or Provinces entering the Union with regularly established systems of government, and existing systems of education defined by law. It was very different when they had to deal with a territory like the North-West, which the Dominion owned by purchase; which possessed no municipi-