

called on to express an opinion respecting it. But we have been so much accustomed, besides, to reciprocal compliments between the parent school system in the States and its offspring in Canada, that we regard this incident in something the same light that we do the little episode of the Hon. Abbot Lawrence's son and the son of the door-keeper sitting on the same school form—which was got up, no doubt, for Canadian effect, as it forms a standing toast among our common school authorities.

Lord Elgin farther says, concerning this boasted system, that it is established "on conditions that can do violence to no principle." Immediately preceding, the Lord Provost made some remarks of a similar nature, as follows: "Canada likewise owes to his administration a boon we have not succeeded in gaining for ourselves, viz., a system of public education that in no wise intermeddles with the rights of conscience." Now, no one knew better than the late Governor-General the principle involved in the contest for separate schools. That contest continued increasing during his whole administration; and to such a height has it now arrived, that during the Parliamentary session of last year, the House of Assembly was so nearly divided on a separate school bill, that the greatest apprehensions were at the time entertained for the safety of the common school system. Lord Elgin could not have been ignorant of this fact, when he made the above statement; nor is he ignorant of the previous fact, that the objections made by the Church of Rome and the Church of England to the school system, are made on the ground of conscience. No longer ago than November last, the Committee of the Parochial Branch of the Church Society in Toronto, presented an address, from which we extract the following, to show the sentiment by which the members of the Anglican Church in Canada have always been actuated, and the ground of conscience on which, exclusively, they rest their objection:—

"The Committee of the Parochial Branch of the Church Society have, since their appointment, anxiously directed their attention to maturing a plan to provide a Scriptural Education for the younger members of the congregation under the supervision of the Clergy, convinced that the Church's mission can never be fulfilled without daily religious instruction forming an important element in her teaching.

The privilege bestowed upon the Church is to watch over her members during every period of their lives, receiving them into her fold at Baptism, and, after carefully instructing them in the divine truths contained in Holy Scripture, calling upon them to assume that responsibility which their God-parents undertook for them in infancy, and thus enabling them fully to enjoy the blessings of the Gospel covenant.

To be able to secure this object, efficient Parochial Day and Sunday Schools are necessary: for, in order to form the character of youth upon a Religious basis, it is essential that constant intercourse should be maintained between them and their clergy, which, under the present public school system, is not attainable.

The Committee see, strongly, that the education in force in the Common Schools in Western Canada, is deficient in those essential points without which education is valueless: for, while it tends to sharpen the intellect, and enable the rising generation to advance their worldly interests, it neglects to inculcate religious knowledge, which alone can make them wise unto salvation.

The Church labours under great disadvantages under the present law,—for, while their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects are allowed to have Separate Schools for their youth, and are free from taxation to support others than their own, in any place where they may consider it desirable to establish them, the United Church of England and Ireland, while equally protesting against the lax system, is denied the same privilege.

But while suffering from this injustice, the Committee cannot allow themselves to remain passive under it, and they are satis-

fied that the surest way to obtain an alteration of the law, is to establish efficient schools in which the younger members of our communion may be taught their duty to God, and learn to love their Mother Church, bringing their influence to bear upon public opinion in after life.

Surely this is sufficient to prove the estimate, in which the School system is held, by at least one respectable and influential section of the community; and, also, to falsify such statements as those made at the Glasgow meeting. We may add that, on the principle of conscience, the opponents of the Government system are every day acquiring fresh strength and increasing in numbers; and that while, on the one side, this state of progress is taking place, so, on the other, the backward condition of the schools, the numerous complaints on this account, and the destitution of competent teachers and superabundance of bad ones, are causes operating gradually and effectually to bring about a natural dissolution of that system respecting which Lord Elgin has taken particular pains to circulate the grossest misrepresentations.

We turn now to that part of the speech which touches on the war. Here the indications are sufficiently plain that no sympathy exists for any participation in the government of the country, while Lord Palmerston, or, at least, the present war policy, is allowed to rule in the cabinet. Lord Elgin is avowedly a peace man. He said just enough about the sword and the scabbard to put himself in good keeping with an audience composed, in part, of numbers who are in favour of prosecuting the war; but at the same time, the whole purport of his remarks is either in condemnation or ridicule of its management, and of the character of British diplomacy in connection therewith. Moreover, we are told, that the war party is in a minority; which may be a sufficient reason for such a far-seeing statesman as Lord Elgin, choosing the stronger side, and associating himself with the friends of peace.

The reference to the Vienna Note is made in a spirit of the bitterest sarcasm. Some strong motive must have influenced Lord Elgin to rake up, from the national sepulchre, this shroud of diplomatic ignorance and folly, which British statesmen had considered, was consigned to everlasting concealment. The following remarks are evidently aimed at Lord Palmerston:—

"I have no hesitation in saying, because I have seen statements made respecting my opinions on the subject—I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion Lord Palmerston and the Government, for some time past, have been carrying on this war in a manner which entitles them to the confidence and support both of those who considered the war a necessity from the commencement, and of those others, a minority certainly in the country, but still a minority embracing many respectable individuals, who wish for its vigorous prosecution now that we are entered upon it. There has been much said of late of negotiations, and I earnestly hope that these negotiations may turn out of some use, but I confess I am not sanguine of them. I think myself—though I should be sorry to say anything that would give offence to persons in authority, for whom I have the highest respect—that since this business began, next to the success of our arms, which we have had much reason to be thankful for, has been the failure of our diplomacy. What would now have been our position if we had succeeded in inducing Turkey to accept the proposition we made to her, contained in the famous Vienna Note, and if, after it was too late to mend the matter, we had found that we had by it secured to Russia every single thing which Prince Menschikoff originally demanded—if, in fact, the eagle of France, and the lion of Great Britain, and the wild beasts of the other countries—had been made to fence the treaty of Kamardji? And what would have been our position if afterwards we had succeeded in inducing Russia to accept the propositions she refused, and thus