

of the soil, as I hope we are, is not one national school good enough for all who are brothers of the soil? That is a consideration that animates the people of the province of Ontario, and are they to be insulted and condemned as illiberal if they think, as the great majority of them do, that those who are sons of the soil, who are brothers of the soil, are good enough to go to one national school and be educated together? That idea is prevalent throughout the province of Ontario. We have a separate school system there, but people are gradually abandoning it. They see these separate schools promote disunion rather than peace and harmony—and yet the latter consideration has been used as an argument for their existence. Under a national school system the people who come into this country are going to become just as good Canadians as foreigners who come into the United States become good Americans. The foreigner who comes to the United States seeks to be naturalized, and being naturalized, he wishes his children to become sons of the soil. That is the great characteristic of the United States. People come in there from all other countries and become brothers, they become unified.

But in this country at present, and for a good many years past, we have been trying to evolve unity out of two races by adopting the worst possible we could, that of maintaining two distinct and separate systems. Not satisfied with possessing that system in the province of Quebec, the people of that province, as I think most ungenerously, are trying to impose it upon the people of the west. I say to the province of Quebec: You have your institutions, you have your laws, you have your language, you have your school system; be content with that and enjoy it if you wish. In Ontario we have a dual school system, and we do not propose to interfere with it. We say to Quebec: Keep what you have, let the people of the west elect what system they will have in regard to education. Is there anything incendiary in the people of Ontario saying that? Has the province of Ontario any interest in that great west?

We have been told about the old *coureurs des bois*, the old voyageurs who discovered the western prairies, who discovered the Mississippi, who were first to see the Rocky mountains, the Red river, the great west. But if they discovered the great west, who developed it? Was it not the province of Ontario? I take a list of the hon. members who make up this House, and when I select the 28 members who sit here representing the 28 constituencies west of Lake Superior, seven-eighths of those men who have succeeded in the west are natives, sons of the soil of the province of Ontario. Surely then the province of Ontario that has given its best blood to develop the west, that has sent thousands of men with its capital, its business instincts, and its enterprise into

that country, has a right to take an interest in the institutions of that country, and that is all that we are doing. We say that the natives of Ontario who are now the majority in the great west and who are building up that country, have a right to say what its institutions should be. We say that the rights of the majority are worthy of respect as well as the rights of the minority. As the member for St. John (Mr. Stockton) said to-night there are two parties in this controversy. Parliament was not intended to devote its energies to the welfare of minorities. Our great duty, our chief duty is to look after the interests of the whole people of this country. All our people ask for is freedom, and all the people of Ontario ask is that those people who went from Ontario and are now settled in the west, who are developing the west, who are giving it a healthy newspaper press, who have taken their municipal institutions, who have taken the school system of the province of Ontario there, shall be left free to have a voice in the selection of the school system that they desire to adopt. Why should the province of Quebec by a solid vote try to impose a school system on these people who come from Ontario these people who are developing the west. Why do they not give to them that freedom which they have claimed and advocated for themselves? Is there anything wrong in asking for the same liberty that Quebec enjoys to-day? I do not think so, and I do not think that any one can be justified in the attacks that have been made upon the liberty of the people of the west.

Mr. PATERSON. If every member from Quebec had abstained from voting what would have been the result of this vote?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not think the question of the hon. gentleman is pertinent, because I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is in power to-day, why? Because of a wrong alliance between a solid Quebec and a great exploiting corporation interest that centres in the city of Toronto, and if the hon. gentleman for Brant the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) thinks he voices the views of the province he knows how to ascertain the exact truth. Let him resign his seat and he will find some one ready to fight out the issue with him.

Mr. PATERSON. The only reason I made the remarks is that the hon. gentleman's remarks may fairly be considered open to the inference that this vote had been carried through a united Quebec.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Or those under the control of Quebec.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I shall now come to the main question. The question before the House and country to-day is one of law or it is one of policy. The Prime Minister said it was one of law; the Minister