

arrive at, after a careful survey of the whole history of the aggrandisement of the Church is very well expressed in a *Toronto Mail* editorial on June 2nd 1894:—"The aim," the writer says, "of ecclesiastical policy commencing with the control of the schools and ending with the control of the voter seems to be the subordination of the State to the Church. That the history of the State in its relation to the Church can convince any rational mind that this sort of thing is tolerable there is every reason to doubt. Let the Church have all the influence for good that is in its sphere, but from the political domain it should be sternly excluded."

#### *Ecclesiastical Corporations.*

Nor is Church connection restricted to the School system of the Province, but in many other respects she claims State recognition and sustenance. Charitable institutions of an avowedly sectarian character receive public appropriations. No rational person would object to a liberal and judicious expenditure of public money in the maintenance of the unfortunate and the afflicted, but the State is not justified in appropriating out of the common fund of a people, so diverse in nationality and creed as the people of Canada are, a sum which largely enriches some ecclesiastical corporation and which tends to strengthen the sinews of sectarian nurseries. According to the statement of Mr. F. F. Chamberlain, Inspector of Public Charities, there are ninety of these sectarian charitable institutions in the Province of Ontario alone, drawing from the provincial government one hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars annually. Why do the Churches cling tenaciously to separate charities? For the same reason that they object to paying for their legitimate share of taxation, and because they find these institutions a good financial investment, providing a substantial profit that may be devoted to other branches of Church work.

#### *Church Exemptions.*

Exemption from taxation is another case in point exhibiting the close relationship between Church and State in Ontario. Such exemption is virtually State support and therefore contrary to the true instincts of the age. It is difficult to understand what good or efficient reason can be advanced against the contention that the Church, like other institutions of the land, should not contribute her fair quota in maintaining the expenses of the municipality. Free police and fire protection, free water and all other adjuncts of a well-regulated municipality, are on a par with the pastor who wants a free newspaper, a generous discount off his grocery bill, or a reduced railroad