

48.
might decide in favour of the child, as they would have a regard to votes. But the county Superintendent would be independent, and would only have the interests of the school at heart.

Mr. LOUNT said there might be a necessity for the compulsory clause in case of cities, but in rural parts it was very objectionable.

It now being six o'clock, the House rose for recess.

After recess,

The House resumed, in committee of the whole, the discussion of the Education Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON moved an amendment, that three trustees—not to constitute a separate body, but with the teacher and inspector to constitute a court—be appointed in order to deal with refractory pupils.

After short desultory discussion,

Mr. RYKERT moved a further amendment, that the decision should be left to the teacher and school trustees.

This amendment was generally agreed to, and eventually was adopted.

Mr. RYKERT moved the addition of the words, "cities, towns and incorporated villages," after the word "inclusive" in the second line of the clause. He intended to move the striking out of the clause altogether at the third reading, but in the meantime would render it as efficient as possible.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON said this amendment was very important, as it interfered with the principle of the Bill. There was more necessity for compulsory education in cities, towns and villages than in the rural districts; but, at the same time, the principle that every person should be educated was intended to be reached by this Bill, and therefore compulsory education should apply to the rural districts. This principle would not cause hardship. The Bill enabled parents who lived in the rural districts, and who were poor, to have the services of their children two-thirds of the year, but secured the child some chance of education during the remaining period. The rich man who had no children, and was compelled to support schools, ought to have education diffused universally, so that his property might be ensured from the depredations of those who were brought up in ignorance. If the rich did not choose to send their children to be educated along with those of the poor, let them educate their children apart.

Mr. RYKERT said the speech of the hon. gentleman would do very well for the stump. He was opposed to the principle of the Bill and so far as the country was concerned, there were a great number of poor attending the schools in the rural districts. He did not believe that the principle of compulsory education was desired by the country, and could not be applied in the rural districts. They had nothing before the House showing that the people desired it. If a man possessed property, but had no children, he should contribute, no doubt, towards the education of the people. He therefore proposed that this principle of compulsory education should be confined to cities, towns and incorporated villages. His opinion with regard to the whole clause was known, and although he might not be supported by the House, he should place his opinion on record on the third reading, by moving its elimination.

Mr. WOOD said it was generally admitted to be the duty of a State to provide for the education of the whole people. The House seemed inclined to support the principle which the Government had adopted of the free school system. Those parties who had no children, and others who failed to avail themselves of the public interest, were taxed equally with others for the educational system of the country. It was but logical that the country, having done so much for education, should go a step further, and enact that the youth of the land for whose benefit the outlay was incurred should be made to attend, in order that the efforts put forth and expense incurred should not be rendered abortive. He supported the system on this principle. He thought the law should be made uniform, and be applied equally to the town and country.

Mr. CHRISTIE said that he would regret very much to see this clause adopted without the amendment that had been proposed.

Mr. MCGILL said that the clause should be adopted, for the principle of compulsory education commended itself to the majority of the people of Ontario.

Mr. RYKERT—How do you know?

Mr. MCGILL said he spoke from what came under his own observation. Let the principle be tried, for it had been found to work well in other countries.

Mr. GALBRAITH said that from the establishment of the free school system, he was convinced that in some parts compulsory education was necessary. (Hear, hear.) In winter children might not be able to go to school, or they might not have clothes; in this case a magistrate would not deal harshly with parents. He knew cases where persons who had no children, but paid school taxes, complained bitterly that certain children should be made to accept compulsory education.

Mr. WALLIS (Toronto) said that he had no doubt the compulsory clause would have a beneficial effect.

Mr. OLIVER said that he would vote against the compulsory clause as it now stood; but he would support it if the mover of the Bill would introduce a safeguard under which it might be worked.

Mr. SECORD would support the compulsory clause. In his days of youth there were no such schools as we now had, and in the case of the children "chill penury repressed their noble rage." (Laughter.) If he had had in his youth the advantages of the children of to-day, he might have been a Caesar or a Scipio. (Loud laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE said that if the compulsory clause were carried, he believed there would be a necessity for some special provision for the creation of industrial schools to make this clause operate in cities and towns. It would be a dead letter in the country districts; for men in the country would not accept the office of school trustee if they had to put this law in operation, and if they were to undertake the invidious task of summoning their neighbours before a magistrate for not sending their children to school. There would be a general understanding in the country that the law would be a dead letter, and nobody would accept the office of trustee. It would inflict positive injury on the country if the House placed on the statute book a law the people would not obey. If there were statistics to show the slow progress of school attendance in comparison with the school population, and that our school population was stationary, he could conceive no subject more urgently needing the attention of the House than the subject of compulsory education. But it appeared to him that statistics, as far as they went, indicated that there was extremely satisfactory progress in school attendance. Last year there had been an increase in school attendance of 12,000; the proportion of school population to school attendance was diminishing; and this was a most satisfactory result, and showed the natural impulse of our people at large to have their children instructed. There had been a very serious defect pointed out in the Bill as to the term of education. He had one observation to make on this subject. He believed if the House were prepared to assent to the principle of compulsory education—namely, that it was the right and duty of the State, in the present condition of popular feeling, to determine that there should be compulsory attendance—he believed that if the House were prepared to assent to this principle, it was stopping short when it stopped at the age of twelve years. The two succeeding years—from twelve to fourteen—would be much more important than the others. The House was certainly taking very strange ground if it should say that the people at large were so insensible to education that they would not send their children to school. He was bound to say he did not believe that much benefit would result from the compulsory clause. There was another difficulty. Our laws were not capable of being altered as regarded the Roman Catholics. With reference to the Roman Catholics, they might have conscientious objections to attending common schools. Our laws provided for the creation of separate schools for the tuition of the children of Roman Catholics. There were many sections in which Roman Catholics could not create separate schools, because they were too poor or too much scattered. He was anxious to see our system of non-denominational schools the only one in the country; but he desired them to exist by the voluntary action of the people; and did not desire that children should be compelled to attend our common schools when their parents and guardians were unwilling. The reports of the Chief Superintendent on this subject were most satisfactory. The country had to congratulate itself that so many Roman Catholics voluntarily sent their children to our schools; there were 40,000 of them at our common, and 20,000 at the separate schools. This state of things was satisfactory, but there would be an entire change if the House once introduced this system of compulsion—if they made that a

measure of course which was now a measure of choice. If, in the rural districts, this law were a dead letter at best—if it were calculated to produce hard feeling—if the circumstances of the country did not require that the House should adopt compulsory education, he failed to see why they should try it as an experiment. He would vote for the amendment of the hon. member from Lincoln, believing that the cases of towns and villages were exceptions, and that the same circumstances were not proved to exist in the rural sections, where the compulsory clause would do more evil than good. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FERGUSON said the increase which had taken place in the school attendance was owing in some measure to the full discussion which took place last session on a similar clause. They all admitted the necessity of education, and he hoped the clause would be carried as it stood.

Mr. RYKERT thought if they were to have a law on their statute book, rendering attendance compulsory, they should have one that would be operative. If a parent was forced to send his child to school, for fear of imprisonment, he would instruct his child to be refractory, and when the child was expelled, there could be no compulsion resorted to to compel his re-attendance, and the law would consequently become imperative. The Prussian system was different to the system proposed; nor was compulsory education the law in the States. People should be coaxed, not forced, into the schools.

Mr. CUMBERLAND would support the amendment, because he thought the experiment should be first tried, since it was in these that there existed the greatest necessity for compulsory attendance.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON defended the clause, and said that he intended to introduce a proviso that no Roman Catholic should be forced to send his child to a Protestant school.

Mr. BLAKE—What do you mean by Protestant schools?

Mr. CAMERON—I mean Public Schools. It had been said that compulsory education had not been tried, and if this was so they could not yet say that it would be unsuccessful. The Chief Superintendent had held conventions in 33 counties, for the purpose of considering the School Bill, and of these 29 declared in favour of compulsory education. Grand Juries, &c., all over the country had declared in its favour. There were 34,000 children not attending school, who were of school age, and it was highly desirable that influence should be brought to bear on these.

Mr. CUMBERLAND—Can you divide these between the counties and cities, towns and villages?

Mr. CAMERON said he could not do so at the present moment, but he believed that the greater number would be found in the country. He did not think that the standing of school trustees would be affected by the clause, as feared by the hon. member for South Bruce. He did not think that the amendment was proposed in its proper place. The clause declared that every child should have the right to be educated, whereas the amendment would have the effect of confining it to cities, towns and villages. (No.) He hoped the House would support the original clause.

Mr. SINCLAIR thought that the legislation on this point should be general. But the hon. Secretary had admitted that it would not be so, by giving exclusive rights to one class. There were others who felt equally repugnant to sending their children to the public schools, and their cases should be considered. He was in favour of the amendment; and with regard to the first part of the clause, he thought it was singularly worded, and its elimination was desirable.

Mr. TROW said the conventions referred to by the hon. Secretary were generally held in county towns and villages, and could not be taken to be an expression of the opinion of the country. There were cases in which it was impossible that children could attend school, from their living so far away from the schools.

Mr. FRASER thought the object of securing at least a rudimentary education for the whole people was a highly important one, and he therefore was inclined to support the clause and give the principle its full application. Of course there were exceptional cases, but otherwise the principle would be generally applicable.

Mr. LOUNT was against the imposition of this clause on rural constituencies, and proposed an amendment to the amendment, that the words "cities, towns and incorporated villages" be inserted after the word "guardian." It had been said that the clause would be inoperative as regarded rural districts, and if so, it was useless and foolish to