

THE WEEK.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 15th, 1892.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 20.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable *in advance*.
Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage prepaid on terms following:—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. Remittances by P.O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.
ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4.00 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.
No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, *Business Manager*, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
European Agents—SMITH, AINSLIE & Co., 25 Newcastle Street, Strand, London.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, *Publisher*.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
Religious and Secular Education	307
A Faulty Division	307
State-Aided Schools	307
Anatomical Material	308
The Osgoode Hall Vacancy	308
Mr. Edgar's Charges	308
The Treaty-Making Question	308
The Main Question	309
Women at the Bar	309
OTTAWA LETTER	T. C. L. K. 309
1492 AND 1892; OR, 1000 AND 1900—WHICH?	W. G. MacFarlane. 309
ROUNDEL	Helen Fairbairn. 310
LITERARY "FAKES"	J. Penn. 310
THREE BOYS' BOOKS	Lee Wynham. 311
WILL YOU FORGET ME, DEAREST? (Poem)	Emma P. Seabury. 311
PARIS LETTER	Z. 311
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The Manitoba School Question	John S. Ewart. 312
Some Forms of Gambling	Dr. Jekyll. 312
TWO PICTURES. (Poem)	Helen M. Merrill. 313
DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY	313
ART NOTES	313
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	313
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	314
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	315
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	315
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	316
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY	318
CHESS	319

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

ALL logical argument should be based on clear definitions. Probably Mr. Ewart may not be to blame for having failed to understand some of the terms used in our remarks on the Manitoba school question in the sense in which they were intended, but it must be evident to the careful reader that, if he had so understood them, a large part of his rejoinder in another column would not have been written in its present form. For instance, Mr. Ewart devotes a considerable part of his article to an attempt to show that our statement that the true Protestant attaches no less importance to religion as an indispensable factor in all education, than the Roman Catholic, is not correct; at least so far as Manitoba is concerned. Now, in the first place, what is meant by *education*? Mr. Ewart's whole argument rests apparently on the assumption that it means simply and only the training which is or ought to be given to children in the public school. We regard the part of education that is or that can be imparted in the public school as but a fragmentary part of the education of the child. He agrees with us that the parent, not the State, is primarily responsible for the education of the child. But his whole argument rests upon the assumption that this work of education as a whole is to be handed over to the State and done in the public school. We, on the other hand, maintain, as we hoped we had made clear, that the State's right to intervene in the matter at all is merely derived and inferential, and that it extends only so far as may be necessary to secure that minimum of intelligence which will fit the man or the woman for the discharge of the ordinary duties of citizenship. Hence when we said that the true Protestant, no less than the true Catholic, regards religion as an indispensable factor of all education, nothing was farther from our thoughts than the notion which Mr. Ewart seems to work from, that the public school is the sole educational agency. We regard it as but one, and by no means the most important one, of a variety of agencies which are or ought to be constantly and simultaneously at work in the educational process. The purely intellectual and moral elements of this training may be relegated (in part) to the public school. Other and higher elements of it the public

school is, from its very nature as the creature of the State, unable to provide. It by no means follows that these elements are not to be supplied by their own proper agencies, *e. g.*, the Church, the Sunday school, above all, the powerful and perpetual influence of parents, and the sacred associations of the home-circle. If it be objected that the latter are too often defective or wholly wanting, we can only reply: "More's the pity." But the public school cannot be and ought not to be relied on to supply the lack. It can be supplied only by the zeal and energy of the agencies which are distinctively religious. When we denied that it is within "either the *power* or the *duty*" of the State to provide for genuine religious teaching we should perhaps have stayed to explain our meaning. By so doing we might have prevented Mr. Ewart from overlooking the word "power" in the construction of his syllogism. That word was of primary importance, for it is evident that what the State cannot, in the nature of the case, do, that it cannot be its duty to do. What we meant to insist on as the true Protestant view is this: Religion is a thing not of the intellect, but of the heart. In other words, it is spiritual in its nature and can be understood and discerned only by the spiritually minded. Hence it can be efficiently taught only by teachers who are spiritually qualified. But the State is not necessarily religious. The Government which constitutes its executive may be infidel or agnostic or even atheistic. Hence it cannot be trusted with the examination of teachers to see whether they are religiously qualified. It will be seen, then, that the fault which vitiates Mr. Ewart's first syllogism is the ambiguity of its middle term, *education*. In the first premiss *education* means and can only mean that modicum of intellectual training which can be imparted in the public school, whereas in the second premiss it must mean the complete round of training and influence which mould the whole nature, intellectual, moral and spiritual.

IN the second place, we must point out very briefly another faulty assumption which quite invalidates Mr. Ewart's argument to show that Protestants in Manitoba do not attach the same importance to religious education as do Roman Catholics. This assumption is that the twofold division, "Protestant and Roman Catholic," exhausts the citizenship of the Province. But Protestants find themselves bound by their own cherished principle of liberty of conscience to have regard constantly to the rights of various classes of citizens who are neither Protestants nor Catholics. There are always a considerable number in every community who do not wish their children to be taught the creeds of either Protestants or Catholics. Some of them belong to no religious sect. Others object on principle to having their children drilled in any dogmatic system. Yet Protestants recognize that the rights of citizenship of these men are just as sacred as those of any other class of tax-payers. Another distinction of still greater importance, in this connection, is the outcome of the principle of religious liberty, which is dear to the hearts of all true Protestants. As a result of the operation of this principle Protestants are divided into numerous sections among themselves, each holding its own peculiar views of religious truth, and differing from others on minor points of doctrinal belief. From these two sources, their regard for the rights of non-believers, and their differences of opinion among themselves, as well as from their broader objections to the teachings of Catholicism, representing as it does the principle of authority as opposed to liberty in religion, also from their utter unwillingness to permit the secular authority to meddle officially with the sacred doctrines of Christianity and the no less sacred rights of conscience, it is surely easy to see why the various Protestant bodies should reach the conclusion that religious teaching in State schools is as impracticable in fact as it is objectionable in theory, and so to acquit them of the charge of being indifferent to religious teaching itself, for which they make other provision.

ADMITTING for argument's sake the force of the objections to religious teaching in State schools, as involving the principle of a union of Church and State, Mr. Ewart goes on to point out what he deems a way of escape from this difficulty, without the sacrifice of the religious

teaching in the schools. He would substitute for the State school, the State-aided or the State-organized school. The objections to both these alternatives are to our thinking so many and serious that we are at a loss to know how to deal with his subject in the small space still at our disposal. As an illustration of the principle involved in the State-aided school, Mr. Ewart instances the case in which the city of Toronto subscribes to the maintenance of some Roman Catholic charity, and says that it is very clear that there is no breach of the principle of separation of Church and State in such an arrangement. We suppose he will think us hopelessly cantankerous when we say that on the contrary we think it a distinct violation of that principle. In the same way we hold that the principle is violated in England, where denominational schools are helped by public funds. On the religious side, we maintain that the Christian religion is a system of voluntarism in its very essence and that one of its fundamental principles is violated whenever a professedly Christian body accepts funds derived by compulsory taxation, for the carrying on of its work of any kind. From the political side we maintain that the system is wrong in principle because the funds collected by the State are trust funds, and the Government and Parliament, which are the trustees of these funds, have no right to appropriate them to any institution which is not under direct Government inspection. Here we note another confusing ambiguity which lurks in the use of the word "religion." Would the Catholics be satisfied with any religious teaching that could possibly be acceptable to Protestants? If not, it is not religious teaching but Roman Catholic teaching for which they are contending. It is well known that doctrines which the Roman Catholic holds to be of the very essence of religion the Protestant regards as the most deadly error, and *vice versa*. What more irrational than for the same Government with the one hand to help spread the disease and with the other supply the antidote? What more unjust than for it to use the taxes paid by the Catholic to aid in the propagation of the doctrines which the good Catholic detests, and the opposite? What more clear than that the only proper and logical attitude for the Government of a free country in relation to the sects is that of strict neutrality? But if not State-aided schools, why not State-organized schools? Why not find a *modus vivendi* in "separate schools with no State aid at all—only a charter?" To prevent misapprehension let us say just here that we hold firmly to the right of any body of people, Catholic or Protestant, or neither, to unite and organize for the establishment and support of schools for the education of their children, on any plan and according to any system which they deem best, so long as the intellectual education provided is sufficiently thorough to meet the reasonable requirements of the State in regard to citizenship. It would be, in our opinion, an outrage to forbid the Catholics from continuing their separate schools for the education of their own children, and, so far as we are aware, no such outrage has ever been proposed in Manitoba. The main question, then, is as to what is meant by the State organization—the charter—under the proposed system? Why should the aid of the State be needed? If merely to confer corporate powers, there could be no objection. But if to enable compulsion to be used to make any one contribute to and patronize a denominational school against his will, simply because he might happen to be recognized as a member of that denomination, we should demur. This suggests other serious objections. Suppose that the different denominations were able and willing to support their respective separate schools, what would be done with the scattered remnants of population, those who would regard it as an infringement upon their rights of conscience to compel them to choose between the denominational schools? If all citizens were either Catholics or Protestants, and the Protestants were as homogeneous in their religious views as the Catholics, the question would be greatly simplified. Even then, however, there would arise the serious question whether the State should have nothing to do with preparing its future citizens for citizenship. On the whole, is it not pretty clear that the fairest settlement of the difficulty is secular teaching by the State, and religious teaching by the parents and the Churches?