

ces against the school system established in the Territories. There was ten years ago a protest on behalf of the Roman Catholics urging that the system worked an injustice to them, but a report by the then minister of justice, Sir John Thompson, did not support that view. There are, it is understood, about sixteen separate schools in the Territories to about 1,000 public schools. This does not sound alarming. Mr Sifton was not alarmed, and never introduced a bill repealing the separate school enactment. He never asked a supporter to do so, if he could not himself without the consent of his colleagues.

It may, therefore, be inferred that Mr. Sifton would be willing to continue the old system, and that his main objection is to the sub-sections of clause 16 under which there is an express provision for the application of public moneys to the support of separate schools. These sub-sections are objectionable to the bulk of the people in the Dominion, and furnish Mr. Sifton with ample justification for his course. Strike out these sections from the Bill and the chances are that Mr. Sifton would resume his portfolio. This would leave the minority with the right to separate schools conferred by the Act of 1875.

The view taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Minister of Justice is that on the admission of the new provinces it is incumbent on parliament, under the Canadian constitution, to give to the minority the educational rights preserved to them by the British North America Act of 1867. In 1875 the Hon. George Brown told Parliament that while he was personally opposed to granting separate schools in the Territories, nevertheless he was of opinion that if parliament did grant them they could not afterwards be taken away. The government is not now proposing to bestow separate schools on the minority in

the new provinces. They are there now and by the constitutional law under which the new provinces are being erected the minority are declared to have the right to separate schools.

The announcement in the House on Wednesday of Mr. Sifton's resignation was an occasion of great interest. The Prime Minister stated that Mr. Sifton had resigned on Feb. 27 on the ground that he could not agree to the education clause of the Autonomy Bill. On Feb. 28 Sir Wilfrid wrote in reply that there was no alternative but to accept his resignation. There were on both sides expressions of regret at the severance of official relations Mr. Sifton made a brief statement to the House, in the course of which it appeared that he only learned the nature of clause 16 on his return from the Southern States after the bill had been introduced. It was evident that he resented the introduction of the bill before his return.

A lively discussion ensued. Mr. Foster the acting leader of the opposition gave a very excellent exhibition of a biting tongue. To his mind the circumstances looked as if it was the intention to get rid of Mr Sifton and he invited the Prime Minister to say whether it was also Mr. Fielding's intention to retire.

Mr. Leighton McCarthy, who has been elected in Simcoe largely on the school issue, announced that he was, like Mr. Sifton, opposed to clause 16. This was offset by a declaration from Mr. Guthrie in favor of the clause and in favor of the bill.

Col. Sam Hughes, in the course of the discussion, said that if the Northwest Rebellion in 1885 was justified the boys of the West would be justified in shouldering muskets to resist this "tyranny." Such language sounds very foolish in view of the fact that the "tyranny" consists of continuing a system of Public and Separate Schools under which these same boys have grown up in the last 30 years.