there can be no question about that. But, as I have said, it is an interference only to the extent of requiring that when a separate school absolutely and entirely complies with the law and then comes before the educational authorities and says : Having complied with the law, being, in every sense of the word a public school, but called a separate school only because we happen to be less in number than the people who organized the public school, we asked to be paid this money in proportion to the efficiency we can show we possess under the educational statutes which you have seen fit to pass—that, when that is shown, the money necessary to the efficiency of the schools shall be given. There is a theoretical—I imagine it would only prove to be a theoretical—interference with the control of the public funds to that extent; but that is the inevitable corollary of subsection 1 ; and I would object to subsection 1 establishing separate schools very much more if it were not accompanied with the provision that the schools established under subsection 1 should be entitled to receive their share of the legislative grant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) a question ? Because, he is very familiar with these ordinances. Subsection 2 says :

> In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any money for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29 or any Act passed in amendment thereof or in substitution therefor, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in said chapter 29.

If a university such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned should be established by an Act in amendment of or in substitution for the ordinances, what, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, will be the effect upon the application of public moneys ?

Mr. SIFTON. I would not think it necessary to give an opinion. Because, why in the name of common sense the legislature of Alberta, when establishing a university, should establish it by an amendment of the school ordinance, I cannot possibly conceive. And, if knowing that in taking such a course, they were going to make themselves liable to a division of the funds, they had so little intelligence as to take it, I do not think this parliament can see far enough ahead to protect them against the consequences of their lack of foresight. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is the kind of man they have in the district of Alberta ; and I want to ask him if he thinks that my hon. friend from Edmonton, if he were in the legislative assembly of Alberta, would be likely to get into such a trap as that ? If the legislature of Alberta puts itself under this section unnecessarily and with malice aforethought they will have to take the consequence ; but they are not obliged to put themselves under this section at all. And let me point out further that the effect of this clause is simply to require that, when the schools—the schools mentioned under the ordinance, and, as a matter of fact they are the primary schools, what we call the public schools, and not the grammar schools, the high schools or collegiate institutes, for I understand that to be the effect of the clause—when they comply with the provisions of the law, they get the ordinary share of the legislative grant. The legislature may set apart money for management, for the conduct of normal schools, for teachers' institutes ; they may set apart money for high schools, universities, agricultural schools—for any and every purpose of education that they may desire; and to these the section will not apply in any way. The legislature will be free unless they deliberately put themselves under this clause intentionally, as they would if they did what my hon. friend suggests.

Now, what I have tried to do in this discussion has been not to waste the time of the House going over and over, and over again what has been said by other speakers as well or better than I could say it, but to endeavour to make clear what the effect of the legislation now proposed to the House will be when it is actually carried into operation. And the conclusion, therefore, is this—that if this legislation is carried into effect it preserves just the two privileges which I spoke of the privilege of the Roman Catholic or Protestant minority to have a separate school house, and the privilege of having religious instruction between half-past three and four o'clock in the afternoon. But there cannot be under this system any control of the school by any clerical or sectarian body. There cannot be any sectarian teaching between nine o'clock in the morning and half-past three in the afternoon. So that, so far as we have objections to separate schools based upon the idea of church control, clerical control, or ecclesiasticism in any form, this system of schools is certainly not open to that objection.

Now, I wish to say a word or two, if the House will pardon me, about my own position in regard to the principle involved in this discussion. I have a record upon this question, as hon. members are all aware. It is of no special importance to the House, and I should apologize for mentioning it were it not for the fact that some reference to it is necessary to the argument which I intend very briefly to present. When we, in the province of Manitoba undertook to remove what was a separate school system, that was ' inefficient to a point of absurdity ' we found ourselves confronted with many and serious difficulties.

The school system which we abolished by the Public School Act of 1890 in the province of Manitoba, was precisely the