

text-book could be used in the Roman Catholic schools without the approval of the "competent religious authority."

Mr. Ewart's decentralizing and ultra-democratic suggestions for overcoming the difficulty will be met with the same disfavor as the Public Schools Act of 1890. To have a portion of the schools of Manitoba, say one-eighth, with the relative proportion probably decreasing, organized separately under the control of the authorities of a special Church; to have that Church dictating the character of the teaching, certificating teachers, and fixing its *imprimatur* on the school and its work, is contradictory to the fundamental idea involved in a state, is an "imperium in imperio," which a free people may justly unite in addressing with Carlyle's words: "Thou art not tolerable."

3. The writer contends that *religion is outside of state interference, unless religion invade the state's domain*. "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," is more than ever coming to be recognized by large numbers of Christians, and by those outside of Christianity as well, as the true principle. The declaration of Jesus Christ, "My kingdom is not of this world," is best interpreted by the statement that the sphere of the Church, of which Christ is the king and head, is outside that of the state. The school of thought in which Mr. Ewart and the writer were brought up in Toronto taught this so certainly, and the consensus of opinion of the vast majority of people in Canada and the United States is so strongly in favor of it, that possibly it is hardly worth while to argue it further.

The limitation, however, is somewhat necessary, that the state may interfere in some cases in the religious sphere. The case of Mormonism is one to the point. There a so-called religious doctrine is regarded by the state as destructive of social order and

is so repressed. Certain churches regard marriage as a religious contract; the state, for cause, dissolves the marriage thus formed, by granting a divorce. Religious bodies, which in their worship destroy the peace of the Sabbath and interfere with public convenience, are rightly checked by the state.

But on the whole, the trend of modern thought is to allow as great liberty as possible to religious opinion. This is willingly allowed where Mr. Ewart's "perfect liberty" cannot be permitted. Probably most would say that should Roman Catholics or others desire to educate their children in private schools at their own expense, so long as illiteracy does not result, it would be well to allow it. But where this is permitted, for Roman Catholics then to put in the plea of exemption from the public school taxes is plainly unjust; for it would violate the condition of equality on which the state is founded, were this allowed. Many Protestants prefer to educate their children at private schools and denominational seminaries. They never dream of asking exemption from the public school taxes. No one rushes to their aid to denounce the state as persecuting them.

And here, too, comes in the opportunity for granting a large amount of liberty to those who desire special "isms" taught their children, and who are willing to pay for it. If some parents wish their children brought up imbued with the principles of "Imperial Federation and Militarism," private enterprise provides such schools, and we might name them, to which they may be sent. The state may deem it wise to shut its eyes to this so long as illiteracy is avoided. Should others desire their children to be immersed in the doctrines of "Pietism, Sabbatarianism and Anti-Alcoholism," for them, too, private or church enterprise will supply schools, such as we might name, and the state may shut its eyes again so long as general edu-