

between the two groups in proportion to population, but should go where it belongs—to the Protestant panel.

I would draw my honourable friend's attention to a fact which he has failed to notice, namely, that school taxation, like all other kinds of taxation, is borne by those who can best afford to bear it; that taxation for school purposes falls ten-fold more heavily upon the rich than upon the poor; that taxation for school purposes in almost every country of the world is levied most where there is most wealth, that is, on the richer people; that, in a word, the rich people of a town or city are obliged to contribute their money towards helping to educate the masses. It is a duty devolving upon the wealthy to pay out their money to help the people at large. For very many years I have been paying taxes to the school board, although no child of mine has ever benefited by the money I contributed. Many are the people who pay their school rates whose children do not go to those schools. Property-owners pay a certain rate and their taxes go into the general coffers for the general welfare of the community.

My honourable friend advocates a national system of schools. If such a system were in existence in the city of Montreal, for instance, what would be the result? Under a national school system there would be but one fund, administered by a school commission or board. Would not the situation be exactly that of which he complains to-day,—the classes helping to educate the children of the masses?

Hon. Mr. POPE: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Are you not getting a great deal of money for agricultural education now from the Dominion of Canada?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not see the point in the question which the honourable gentleman puts.

Hon. Mr. POPE: The money comes from the Dominion. Is it not applied by the provinces?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: That is not what the honourable gentleman (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) is discussing.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not catch the meaning of the comparison or the point in my honourable friend's (Hon. Mr. Pope's) argument. The provinces are undoubtedly receiving money for agricultural purposes, and it is spent for the general advantage of the province. But the point which I want

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

to make is that if to-morrow we were to have one system of national or common schools in the city of Montreal, where Catholics and Protestants would be treated alike, the same situation would exist as already prevails there. There would be in the treasury the accumulated money paid by all the ratepayers into one fund and it would be expended in the education of the masses, and it would be the classes, or the wealthy people, the industrial people, who would subscribe the most. In other words, my honourable friend would claim, if in a community like Toronto, for instance, there happened to be one hundred wealthy Catholic corporations representing one-half of the industries,—that the amount which they contributed should be monopolized by them to educate the children of their own shareholders, and that their money should not help to educate the children of any other persuasion; that that money should be spent only for their own advantage. My honourable friend does not consider the community as a whole. He does not realize that if there are, as in the city of Toronto or Montreal, half a million people, it is the duty of the whole community to make the necessary provision for the education of the masses, and it is not right for the wealthy who may happen to belong to a different persuasion from that of the majority to say: "We will not contribute taxes to help to educate the majority of the people." My honourable friend spoke about corporations who are contributing to the neutral panel. He said that if we scrutinize the list we shall find that the shareholders are in the majority Protestant, and that the moneys of those corporations should not go to educate the vast majority, which happens to belong to another faith. But it must be remembered that the majority plays a part in the maintenance of the industry. It furnishes the labour, and if the majority belonging to another faith represents 75 per cent of the population, it does not preclude the manufacturer from drawing from the masses all the labour necessary for the carrying on of his enterprise, and we all recognize that labour plays a part in industry.

But there is another point. How long would those industries continue if the 75 or 80 per cent, forming the majority of the people and belonging to another persuasion, were to stop purchasing what was produced by the industries? The industry draws from the masses the labour which it needs, and receives back part of the wages which it has paid to the labourer for the