

schools as irreligious and immoral, the most thorough biblical and moral instruction in the schools would not satisfy them, unless the dogmas of their Church are taught, under the direction of their clergy.

The same thing is seen in the zeal for doctrinal teaching shown by the High Church party in England. Under the plea of zeal for religion, they are now pressing the present Government to reward their Church, for the help given in the recent election, by a large grant for Church schools. The London Speaker, in a recent issue, says :

"It is in the name of religion that they make this outrageous demand, and they try to bolster up their cause by appealing to the natural feeling of their fellow-countrymen in favour of the training of our children in the faith of their fathers. We are willing to admit that they are perfectly sincere in thus confounding the cause of religion with the cause of a particular denomination. That is the common error of all sectarians. But it is obvious that this country many years ago decided formally that the funds of the State should not be employed in teaching the dogmas of any particular Church, and that we should violate this great Constitutional principle, established in the first instance by the Liberal party and long since accepted by the Tory party, if we were now to yield to the clerical demands. Furthermore, it has been made abundantly clear that if once we agree to permit dogmatic teaching at the public expense, we cannot draw any line that will effectually limit the dogmas taught. We shall have to pay for teaching doctrines which are most directly opposed to each other, and which are not only repudiated but detested by those who are forced to contribute to the cost of spreading them."

It is extraordinary that at a time

when the claims of Church schools in England are calling forth the strongest protests from Nonconformists and causing extensive strife and irritation, any Canadian should point to the sectarian schools of England as something that should help to reconcile us to Separate schools for Manitoba. England has many undesirable things, like the crooked streets in her quaint old towns, that have grown so and cannot well be changed now. But it would be folly for us, who are free to build as we deem best, to copy what must be regarded as blemishes and hindrances to progress, rather than laudable things worthy of imitation.

I am aware that it may be said that even the moderate and liberal degree of moral training which I have indicated, may be the occasion of conscientious objections to some parents. Well, in all such cases the school authorities must decide whether the complaint is just and reasonable or not. If any parent objects that what is taught to his children is untrue or wrong, his objection should receive due attention, whether his judgment be deemed right or not. No child should be subjected to any religious instruction to which its parents object. But an objection to a school, because the doctrines of any Church are not taught in it, does not deserve the same consideration. If any unbeliever objects to his children receiving any Christian teaching, his wish should be duly regarded. But such a one has no right to demand that the order of the school, or the law that enjoins it, should be framed according to his particular belief. The conscience of the minority should be duly protected against any violation or infringement : but no minority of the people have any right to demand that their views,