fines the meaning of certain expressions and provides for amendments and repeal and all that sort of thing. In the Territories there was an interpretation ordinance passed, which was allowed by the Dominion and has never been questioned. Ordinance No. 10, section 1, passed in 1879, before any school ordinance was enacted, reads as follows :

> Every ordinance shall be so construed as to reserve to the Lieutenant Governor in Council the power at any time of repealing or amending it, and of revoking, restricting or modifying any power, privilege or advantage thereby vested in or granted to any person or party, whenever such repeal, amendment, restriction or modification is deemed by the Lieutenant Governor General in Council to be required for the public good.

I do not know whether there could be anything clearer than that, and it provides that every ordinance, first and last, shall be subject to repeal or amendment. Therefore, when we are looking at any ordinance, whether 29 or 30 or any other, the question is not whether it is an amendment or whether it has reduced any privilege or anything of that kind, but simply whether the ordinance, as it stands, could have been originally passed.

What was done by ordinance ? At first there was a system under which a board of twelve was appointed—six Roman Catholics and six Protestants. Later on that was changed by another ordinance and the board consisted of eight—five Protestants and three Roman Catholics. That might be said to be a change to the disadvantage of Roman Catholics, inasmuch as instead of having one half the board they had only three-eights. But there was no question about its validity, although it did affect the Roman Catholics, and it was never disallowed or questioned. But both those ordinances did give a very substantial privilege to Roman Catholics or Protestants as the case might be. Both provided that the three or the six Roman Catholics, had the control of the Roman Catholic schools, and the Protestants had a like control, and supervision of the Protestant schools. That undoubtedly was a boon and privilege to those who took an interest in their own schools. But subsequently there were changes, and in 1892, the ordinances were very materially changed. The board was abolished, and a council of public instruction established. That council consisted of members of the executive with four appointed members—two Roman Catholics and two Protestants—but the appointed four were to have no vote. That was a material change, and the sectional control of separate schools was removed. Instead, the control, both of Roman Catholic and Protestant schools, was given to the whole board. That was coming nearer to the Ontario system. In Ontario, the whole board controls all schools, Roman Catholic schools, Protestant schools, and coloured schols. I may say that in Ontario a separate school may consist of coloured people, and I do not know that because they are coloured people, there is any religious instruction to be implied. It is granted simply in order that coloured people may send their children to a school by themselves. That change met with very vigorous protest ; and in 1893 an application was made to the Governor General in Council to disallow those ordinances on the ground that they had taken away privileges previously enjoyed. The subject was very carefully gone into by a committee of the Privy Council, and the result was a refusal to disallow the ordinances of 1892. That committee seemed to think that perhaps some hardship had been suffered, and they recommended those who had been complaining to see the Lieutenant Governor in Council and endeavour to get some modification ; but there was no decision that the ordinances was not strictly within the power of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That ordinance of 1892 is practically 29 and 30, but instead of two Catholics and two Protestants, they have now three Protestants and two Catholics. Separate or sectional control is not allowed except that there are separate school trustees, who appoint teachers, &c. After that disallowance there was a very vigorous complaint from his Grace Archbishop Taché and others. On the 7th March, 1894, the archbishop addressed the Governor in Council, and in the memorial which he presented he complained very bitterly of what had been done. The whole subject was fully discussed, with the result that no action was taken, except to refer the matter to the Territorial authorities. So, Mr. Speaker, the ordinances 29 and 30, which are now introduced into the Bill before the House, were never disallowed, and are undoubtedly Territorial law.

But the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was apparently afraid that the changes in the ordinances might be ultra vires, and that some of the old privileges might be brough back to life, he thought a report of Sir John Thompson on the 10th of January, 1900, supported his view. But the report of Sir John Thompson was on a very different subject. It had nothing to do with school regulation, nothing to do with any change of one ordinance by another ordinance. I do not think anybody questioned that the ordinance Sir John Thompson dealt with was ultra vires. Under the Act of 1875, it had been provided that the minority, Roman Catholic or Protestant, could establish separate schools. But as the ordinance Sir John Thompson reported on was worded, it was provided that only after a public school district had been formed could the minority establish