

power over the ruin of some great educational principle. Can we not trust the people of the west to guard themselves against interlopers, against those who will not enter the door, but climb in at the windows, and lay sacrilegious hands on the sacred principle of free and undenominational education? Can we not trust them to be the guardians of their own honour and their own schools? I am willing to trust them, and I hope this House is willing to trust them. My hon. friend has made one other point to which some importance may be attached, and yet it vanishes on a little closer examination. That point was that this grant, under the term 'schools,' may include high schools. Supposing it does, who is hurt? High schools are to be paid for by taxes the same as public schools. The money that maintains high schools in Ontario comes out of the same pockets that maintain the public schools. You may say that public schools are fundamental; but high schools are not.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I did not refer to high schools; I referred to universities, and institutions of higher education.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—I do not think this money could go to a university. A university is not called a school in the language of any educational authority I know of. But I had better not drop the other subject quite. In the United States, as in Ontario, the high school is really part of the public school system, and I think the legislature would be perfectly justified in establishing schools the upper department of which would be equivalent to a high school.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—They have them now. They are public schools to-day?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—Then I am on the right track; that they might establish schools that would give higher education, and, therefore, the diversion of this fund, if it were intended for higher education, apart from universities, would be within the meaning of the Act. I do not think this grant would go to the universities, but that it would go precisely as provided by the constitution of Alberta. It will go, by clause 42, without the word

'public,' where it was intended to go, and the language is identical in both cases—to public and separate schools irrespective of religious denominations and if, in the future, other schools were established by the province, I do not know that this House should dictate to the province exactly how they should distribute their school funds, or what kind of schools they should establish. We in Ontario would not thank them if they said to us: You cannot establish any kind of school of any character in your wisdom you see fit to do; and what we are unwilling should be a charge on the province of Ontario, we are unwilling should be imposed on any other province.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I want to call attention to what has taken place in the other Chamber when this matter was under discussion. Dr. Schaffner (Souris) moved an amendment to this Bill at the third reading, to refer it back to a Committee of the Whole in order that it might be amended by providing that pending the transfer to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba of the Dominion lands within their boundaries, the school lands and all funds arising therefrom shall be handed over to those provinces. That was voted on by a straight party vote. The hon. gentleman's friends in the House of Commons were prepared to hand over not only the interest on the fund for educational purpose, but to transfer to the provinces the whole of the funds and lands and I think there ought to be a reconciliation between the hon. gentleman and his friends in the other House, before he takes exception to the provision of this Bill which, as stated by the hon. senator from Middlesex, conforms exactly with the words of the Alberta Autonomy Act.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—The course pursued by the Minister of the Interior who has had this Bill in charge with regard to this subject does not appear to me one that any hon. gentleman could commend. The change of the word was done without any attention being called to it in the other branch of parliament, as far as I can learn; and, further, there has been a note in the original Bill