

ed on the principle of "Education without subscription to religious creeds and articles," are naturally surprised that, in a country so free from ecclesiastical monopoly and ascendancy as this, there should be a disposition to palter and compromise, however slightly, where the complete freedom of religion from state or municipal support or patronage is concerned. But the world moves; and now the kith and kin of those who, although eager for knowledge and culture, could not enter the ancient universities of England without violating their consciences and selling their souls, can partake at these venerable seats of learning the rights and privileges which no free-born Englishman should ever have been denied. At the same time, it ought not to be forgotten that the process of disentanglement is slow, and that there are many who still cling to the old views in regard to the connection of Church and State, whose opinions are natural and therefore entitled to respect.

Among the school boards of England the battle for complete religious freedom is going bravely on; and, probably, we shall learn, ere long, that elementary education in that country, so far as sustained directly or indirectly by the state, is entirely and forever emancipated from ecclesiastical control. Then, as supported and propagated by its inherent and divinely communicated power, we may expect its prosperity and extension, according to the earnestness and diligence of those who already possess it, and as furthered by the blessing of Him who is both its author and its end. In framing the Irish system Mr. Stanley (Lord Derby) suggested that it should afford, if possible, "a combined literary and a separate religious education." Subsequently the Commissioners appointed to carry out this view objected to commit themselves to this system, on the ground that it excluded religion altogether from the combined instruction. In deference to their opinion the first draft of Mr. Stanley's letter was altered with the consent of the Govern-

ment, and the Commissioners described the system as to be established for "combined moral and literary, and separate religious instruction." The concession thus mildly made to the principle of connexion between Church and State has not, in the long run, brought about that harmony and mutual good will which the noble and liberal men who instituted and first directed the Irish system so earnestly desired. Why, it may be asked, should not local rates and public grants, which are exclusively based on the authority of national, provincial, or municipal law, and to which persons of every religious creed, or of no religious creed, are compelled directly or indirectly to contribute, be exclusively applied for the promotion of that secular education which all require, and without a measure of which neither man nor woman can efficiently discharge the duties which the members of the body politic owe to each other and to the government which protects the persons and the property of all? Do those among us who profess the Christian faith think so meanly of its worth and power that they cannot trust its extension to those who hold and exemplify it? Have we no religious parents, no Christian ministers, no Christian churches or associations, no Sunday schools—no means whatever for the propagation of the faith? Let then the state attend to its own affairs and interests, and let churches and religious teachers and organizations of every kind attend to theirs. In actual Public School teaching what we need is not instruction in church principles or theological dogmas, but the illustration on the part of the teacher, in all his teaching and influence, of that truthfulness, righteousness, good will, propriety and courtesy which religion inculcates, and which are as useful among men as we believe they are acceptable to God. Teachers in Public Schools may teach religiously, if they do not undertake to teach religion. Their motives and their spirit may be unostentatiously religious and then their influence