

sale of its wares to the latter. Is it not just that the wealthy should help to educate the children of the working men? Is that not what is done all over the world? It so happens that the schools are divided as between Protestants and Catholics, and that in a certain group there is a majority of Catholics representing the masses of the people. That is quite natural in a province which is nine-tenths or eight-tenths Catholic, and in which the rural municipalities are constantly furnishing large numbers of people to the cities, thus increasing their population. Is it not natural that the masses in the cities should represent the religious persuasion of the majority in the province? Under those conditions does the argument stand that the rich, who happen to be a small minority, who are the manufacturers, should complain at their funds being used in part in order to help to educate the children of their workingmen who are helping to run the wheels of industry? As a matter of fact, that question of the neutral panel is the only complaint which I have heard from any representative of the minority, either here or elsewhere, against the majority in the province of Quebec. I wish to God that we of the majority in Quebec had no other complaint to make on behalf of our own minorities in other provinces.

My honourable friend advocates national schools, directed from Ottawa, and before I discuss the reasons which he gives, I would draw his attention to this fact, disagreeable as it may seem to him, that the pact of 1867 assigned the question of education and the administration of schools exclusively to the provinces. That is a condition. He may desire something else, but he must face that condition, that a contract was entered into by the provinces and that it was confirmed by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. Does my honourable friend expect that a simple resolution from this Chamber, approved though it might be by the House of Commons, would be accepted in the Imperial Parliament as satisfactory evidence that there was unanimity of opinion in favour of altering the constitution? Does my honourable friend believe that when Ontario signed its name to the pact and Quebec did likewise, it can be altered without their consent or that of their legislators in one of its essential conditions? Ever since Confederation the principle has been admitted that no change can be made in the constitution of Canada, bearing upon matters affecting the provinces or the rights which accrue to them under the constitu-

tion, unless those provinces through their legislatures express their willingness. From Sir John A. Macdonald to Sir Robert Borden, the present Prime Minister, it has been admitted that the four provinces that entered into the compact of 1867 must agree to any material change in the constitution by an expression of opinion from their respective legislative assemblies. If that be so, my honourable friend, while entitled to express his views on the floor of this House, must realize that he is only carrying on an educational campaign which will have to mould the opinions of the legislatures of the provinces, or a majority of those legislatures, before he succeeds in having his views listened to by the Imperial Parliament. I am quite sure my honourable friend would not treat as a "scrap of paper" an agreement which has been thus solemnly entered into. He has, in fact, stated that he would be the last man to suggest that the rights of the French minority should be invaded, but he must at the same time admit that the rights of the various provinces should not be infringed either.

My honourable friend has said that he wanted national schools because the present system has failed to develop a strong national sentiment. He has mentioned Switzerland and Belgium as countries where more than one language is spoken, which have developed a strong national sentiment because of their common schools. I may inform my honourable friend that he is right as to Switzerland when he affirms that there is a general system of schools, although they are managed by the respective cantons, or provinces, as we would say. He is wrong when he speaks of Belgium. Belgium has not had common schools. It has had public schools here and there, but it has had as many separate schools as it has had common schools, and all are recognized and subsidized by the State. The reason which he has given for the development of a national sentiment, namely, common schools, is not the correct one. He will find the reason in the fact that there is but one nation and one ideal with the Swiss people, and likewise but one nation and ideal with the Belgian people. The situation with us is different. My honourable friend has expressed his surprise at finding recently that there was no unity of sentiment in Canada. I believe he knew that fact for quite a time. I will refresh his memory on that point. How can there be a national ideal when there is no nation? Canada is but a colony. The Canadians have individual ideals, that is all.