

cure which this Bill will give. I count upon the support of our countrymen to enable us to close forever these barren controversies which for too long have occupied our time and in the interests alike of parental liberty and of educational efficiency to terminate the present system of costly confusion.

"If I quote these sentences, it is because they express in far better, far loftier language than I can command my own view in regard to these questions in general. If I could have my wish in the forming of these two new provinces, it would be that in the conduct of public affairs, particularly in the treatment of the minority—which practically whatever we may enact is entirely confided to the generosity of the majority—they may have men to lead the destinies of these two great provinces according to the example of this great statesman of England."

Mr. Sifton's speech was looked forward to with keen interest, and those who expected that he would clearly vindicate his position were not disappointed. It was Mr. Sifton's resignation of the Interior portfolio that precipitated a crisis, and what he had to say was naturally considered important. He began with a reference to the irony of political fate that caused him to retire from the cabinet over a bill dealing with the Northwest country for which he had so much solicitude during his term of office. Referring to the criticism addressed to the Prime Minister based on the assertion that he had not been consulted in regard to this bill, so far from this being the case he had upon various occasions given his attention to the contents of such a Bill and he had even put his views in writing, and, also when absent had corresponded with the Prime Minister. Indeed, Mr. Sifton said, that, substantially, the bill he recommended to the government is the Bill that was introduced with the exception of the education clause. He was in favor of two provinces instead of one. He justified the policy of the Dominion retaining the public land chiefly on the ground that spreading it among three provinces would interfere seriously with the successful prosecution of a settlement policy. After criticizing some

of the details of the Bill Mr. Sifton came to the education clause. In dealing with this question the ex-minister of the Interior went into it thoroughly, as he always does with all large questions, and started from the day in 1875 when separate schools were authorized. He showed that when the Northwest School Ordinance of 1892 was passed these schools ceased to be denominational or sectarian schools. The clerical control of these separate schools was absolutely abolished, the existing system of so-called separate schools are, from 9 in the morning to 3.30 in the afternoon, secular schools and all that this Bill does is to continue that system. That system was the system which they found set up by the Northwest people. The effect of section 2 was simply to require that when the public schools comply with the provisions of the law they get the ordinary share of the provincial grant. It is only when a separate school absolutely and entirely comply with the law and then come before the educational authorities and say: Having complied with the law, being in every sense of the word a public school, but called a separate school only because we happened to be less in number than the people who organized the public schools, we ask to be paid this money in proportion to the efficiency we can show we possess under the educational enactments which you have seen fit to pass. When that is shown the money necessary to the efficiency of the school shall be given. That was a theoretical interference with the control of the public funds, but Mr. Sifton regarded it as poor statesmanship to authorize separate schools and not provide for their efficiency. The principal ground for abolishing these separate school system in Manitoba was its inefficiency. Mr. Sifton defended the abolition of separate schools in Manitoba.

Upon the constitutional question Mr. Sifton contended that the Dominion Parliament was the only body which could settle this question on its merits. The Imperial Parliament could not, be they would deal with it as recommended by the Dominion Parliament. If it is necessary, therefore, to vary the B. N. A. Act of 1871 the necessary authority could be obtained. Had he