

all others, is as unjust as it is unsatisfactory. How religion can be imparted in State-aided schools is, it is confessed, a difficult question, but the difficulties of the case should not lead us to acquiescence in a system in which religion is entirely banished. Against this state of things there has been a protest from our synods as well as from some of the other religious bodies of the country, and there are indications that in Ontario at least, there is a disposition on the part of the Government to meet the views which have been thus expressed. No one uniform system will meet the varying views which are entertained, or the necessities of the case. Nothing short of Separate schools or State aid to voluntary schools where they can be had, combined with some place for the imparting of the principles of religion and morality in schools generally, will meet the demand for more religious instruction. The following schemes have been suggested: 1st. That the schools remain as at present, viz., Roman Catholic Separate schools—and common schools in which religion is recognized by the school being opened with prayer and the reading of some brief selected portion of Holy Scripture. This has proved unsatisfactory, because it gives to one denomination a right denied to all others, and because experience has proved that the provision in regard to religion is too meagre and too perfunctorily performed to have very perceptible influence upon the pupils. 2nd. That some definite scheme of religious instruction be agreed upon, undenominational in character, which all the children shall be required to attend, with a conscience clause exempting all children whose parents object thereto. This might answer in neighborhoods where the population is small and but one school could be maintained, but to this there are evident objections.

First, the difficulty of deciding on such a scheme. And, secondly, the still greater difficulty of being sure that the teacher has the moral and religious qualifications to fit him or her to act as a teacher of religious truth. If the scheme were one that included anything but the great elementary truths of religion, objection would not be wanting, and the conscience clause would be taken advantage of by many parents, and the children deprived of the religious training. On the other hand if the instruction be so meagre as not to include what is necessary properly to teach faith and morals, then the instruction would be comparatively valueless. The chief difficulty, however, would be the teacher. Who could vouch for or inquire into the teacher's soundness in the faith. Trustees of schools may, or may not be believers in the Christian religion. However simply Christian doctrine might be stated, and however much it might be reduced, it would be too much for an Agnostic or a Unitarian. Then, not a few teachers, like Gallio, care for none of these things, and how could such teach subjects which should be treated with reverence and the interest that can only come from profound conviction. Religious instruction under such convictions would be a mockery and worse than none. 3rd. It has been proposed in some of the Anglican synods that a stated portion of time each day be devoted to religious instruction, and that the clergy, or recognized and authorized teachers of each Church or sect, be allowed to give the children of their particular denomination religious instruction. This, if granted, might be a valuable concession, and in some cases might be useful, but we fear it is unsuited to many localities, and in practice would be found unworkable. For instance, the number of children in any one school of