

cation is not neglected. So with schools to educate the young in Conservatism or Liberalism, in Aestheticism or Dogmatism, in Anglicanism or Agnosticism. One may express doubt as to the wisdom of such a course on the part of parents; but they may enjoy the luxury, by paying for it.

When, however, such an one approaches the state to demand exemption from paying his public school taxes, the Privy Council, the people of Manitoba, and, we venture to think, common sense, unite in saying: "The public schools are for all: they may be used by all: thou art asking an advantage over thy fellow subjects: thy claim is not tolerable.

Nor does our advocacy of the principle of the separation of church and state justify Mr. Ewart's dithyrambics at the close of his article, where he says: "And so secularism must have its day, and show what of weal or woe there is in it. It may be the 'ultimate infallible credo'; but it, too, most probably will sink into the ditch and become a dead body, and a warning for all later cock-sure philosophers."

The public schools of Manitoba are supported by the vast majority of the religious people of Manitoba. And in Manitoba the religious education of the children is not neglected. The Church, the Sunday School and the family circle are all agencies for cultivating the religious life of the young. The public schools of Manitoba are essentially the same as the public schools of Ontario. In Ontario the second and third generations of the population have grown up under this system.

The writer has seen many countries of the world, but can say with firmest belief that nowhere will be found a more intelligent, sober, and religious people than the people of Ontario. There are probably fewer secularists or infidels in Ontario than in any population of its numbers in the world. As the writer has said elsewhere, if

there be a defect either in Ontario or Manitoba it is because the Church has not done its work thoroughly; it is not the fault of the public school.

In conclusion, the writer is of opinion that the people of Manitoba have followed a wiser and more patriotic course than that suggested by Mr. Ewart with his lax and unphilosophic plan of so-called toleration. The problem facing Manitoba was unique. The province was made up of people of many nations. Its speech is polyglot, with the majority English speaking; it has eight or ten thousand Icelanders; it has fifteen thousand German-speaking Mennonites; it has some ten or twelve thousand French-speaking half breeds and Quebecers; it has considerable numbers of Polish Jews; it has many Hungarians and Finlanders; it has Gaelic-speaking Crofter settlements. The Icelanders petitioned the Educational Board, of which the writer is a member, for liberty to have the Lutherans prepare their candidates for confirmation in the schools: the Mennonites with singular tenacity have demanded separate religious schools: the French had their Catholic schools, and their spirit may be seen when their late superintendent, Senator Bernier, refused to consent to a Protestant being a member of a French-Canadian society: many of the other foreigners are absolutely careless about education.

What could patriotic Manitobans do? They were faced with the prospect of whole masses of the population growing up illiterate. The Mennonites, who came from Russia, are more ignorant to-day as a people than when they came from Russia eighteen years ago. Yes, British Manitoba has been a better foster-mother of ignorance than half-civilized Russia had been.

The only hope for the province was to fall back on the essential rights of the province, and provide one public school for every locality, and have a