

venience, may procure smooth sailing for a time, but it is a policy analogous in its results to the proverbial sowing of the wind.

This tendency has been displayed to a very marked degree in certain quarters in discussing and in dealing with the Manitoba School Question—a question involving issues of the most fundamental importance. Besides this peculiar and unfortunate inability to apprehend the question in the abstract, there has been displayed a most extraordinary ignorance and misconception with regard to the actual concrete facts of the case. In many instances the ignorance and misconception are undoubtedly unconscious. In others it is impossible to avoid the conviction that the misapprehension is wilful, and therefore dishonest.

In view of these considerations, and also of the fact that no comprehensive and connected statement of this case from an impartial or a Manitoban standpoint, has yet been presented to the public, the writer has penned these pages. He is fully—even painfully—aware of the imperfections which characterize this effort, but he trusts that at least the salient facts of the case, and the essential principles involved, are placed in such bold, even if rude, relief, that the public cannot fail to see what they are. If he has succeeded in this, he considers that he has amply atoned for his rhetorical defects, as he feels that the case of Manitoba is so intrinsically sound and strong, that its presentation with some degree of fulness even by a “prentice han” cannot fail to carry conviction to any reader whose mind is open to it.

THE WRITER.

WINNIPEG, June 1st, 1895.

In  
gov  
itus  
toer  
till t  
tury  
ernm  
erag  
mass  
hold  
cure  
class  
age  
such  
and  
ed la  
or i  
pow  
cont  
law  
The  
tries  
ply  
sour  
splen  
draw  
and  
nece  
cong  
thes  
fend  
and  
fore  
such  
prim  
rule  
the  
accr  
cide  
lligic  
in t  
in  
tain  
has