

of the Principal from the school and his failure to secure pupils to fill vacancies. "Progress", the paper published at the school, refers to his lecturing tours, missionary work and trips east and west, all of which take up time that should be devoted to the school. No doubt he has the sanction of the Church for these absences, but while he is away, their interests suffer and they wish to hold the Department responsible. Since the death of the late Principal the Indians appear to be averse to sending their children to the school. The ~~Report~~ report does not ^{say} ~~state~~ why this state of affairs exists, but such is the fact, nevertheless. A Principal can make or mar a school and late Mr McLeod placed this institution in the foremost rank of Indian schools in the Dominion and Mr Sinclair succeeded to it when it was at its zenith, popular with the Indians and free from debt. In less than three years it is over head and ears in debt, discredited by whites and Indians and fast running down. Who is to blame for all this? The report fixes no blame on the Principal, - in fact, it almost ignores him. I think he was entitled to some prominence, as he is certainly responsible for the present condition of affairs.

Paragraph 8 deals with the earnings of the school on the per capita basis and I may say that the gentlemen who signed the report have failed to acquaint themselves with the working of this system. The per capita grant is not paid on the average attendance but upon the individual earnings of each pupil, calculated for the number of days in each quarter that he was present in the school, and the only way in which the school can draw the full grant is when