

ed disciplinary duties of pastors and members of religious persuasions by not permitting their children to enter the public schools until their parents and pastors had taught them the catechism of their own church. The theory, therefore of denominational day schools is as inexpedient on religious grounds as it is on the grounds of economy and educational extension. The demand to make the teacher do the canonical work of the clergyman is as impolitic as it is selfish. Economy as well as patriotism requires that the schools established for all should be open to all upon equal terms and upon principles common to all—leaving to each religious persuasion the performance of its own recognized and appropriate duties in teaching its own catechism to its own children. Surely it is not the province of government to usurp the functions of the religious persuasions of the country; but it should recognize their existence, and therefore not provide for denominational teaching to the pupils in the day schools, any more than it should provide such pupils with daily food and raiment, or weekly preaching or places of worship. As the state recognizes the existence of parents and the performance of parental duties by not providing children with what should be provided by their parents—namely, clothing and food;—so should it recognize the existence of the religious persuasions and the performance of their duties by not providing for the teaching in the schools of that which each religious persuasion declares should be taught by its own ministers and the parents of its children.

4. But, it may be asked, ought not religious instruction to be given in day schools, and ought not government to require this in every school? I answer, what may or ought to be done in regard to religious instruction, and what the government ought to require, are two different things. Who doubts that public worship should be attended and family duties performed? But does it therefore follow that government is to compel attendance upon the one, or the performance of the other? If our government were a despotism, and if there were no law or no liberty, civil or religious, but the absolute will of the Sovereign, then government would, of course compel such religious and other instruction as it pleased,—as is the case under despotisms in Europe. But as our government is a constitutional and a popular government, it is to compel no farther in matters of religious instruction than it is itself the expression of the mind of the country, and than it is organized by law to do. Therefore, in the "General Regulations on the Constitution and Government of Schools respecting religious instruction," (quoted in a note on a preceding page) it is made the duty of every teacher to inculcate those principles and duties of piety and virtue which form the basis of morality and order in a state, while parents and school teachers and school managers are left free to provide for and give such further religious instruction as they shall desire and deem expedient. If with us, as in despotic countries, the people were nothing politically or civilly but slaves and machines, commanded and moved by the will of one man, and all the local school authorities were appointed by him, then the schools might be the religious teachers of his will; but with us the people in each municipality share as largely in the management of the schools as they do in making the school law itself. They erect the school-houses; they employ the teachers; they provide the greater part of the means for the support of the schools; they are the parties immediately concerned—the parents and pastors of the children taught in the schools. Who then are to be the judges of the nature and extent of the religious instruction to be given to the pupils in the schools—these parents and pastors, or the Executive Government, counselled and administered by means of heads of departments, who are changed from time to time at the pleasure of the popular mind, and who are not understood to be invested with any religious authority over the children of their constituents?

5. Then if the question be viewed as one of fact, instead of theory, what is the conclusion forced upon us? Are those countries in Europe in which denominational day schools alone are established and permitted by government, the most enlightened, the most virtuous, the most free, the most prosperous, of all the countries of Europe or America? Nay, the very reverse is the fact. And it were not difficult to show that those denominational schools in England which were endowed in former ages, have often been the seats of oppressions, vices, and practices, that would not be tolerated in the most imperfect of the common schools of Upper Canada. And when our common schools were formerly, in regard to government control, chiefly under the management of one de-

domination, were the teachers and schools more elevated in their religious and moral character, than at the present time? Is not the reverse notoriously the case? And if enquiry be made into the actual amount of religious instruction given in what are professedly denominational schools, whether male and female, (and I have made the enquiry,) it will be found to consist of prayers not more frequently than in the common schools, and of reciting a portion of catechism each week—a thing which is done in many of the common schools, although the ritual of each denomination requires catechetical instruction to be given elsewhere and by other parties. So obviously unnecessary on religious grounds are separate denominational schools, that two school-houses which were built under the auspices of the Church of England for parish schools of that church—the one at Cobourg, by the congregation of the Archdeacon of York, and the other in connection with Trinity Church, Toronto East—have, after fair trial, been converted for the time being into common school houses, under the direction of the Public Boards of School Trustees in Toronto and Cobourg.

6. I am persuaded that the religious interests of youth will be much more effectually cared for and advanced, by insisting that each religious persuasion shall fulfill its acknowledged rules and obligations for the religious instruction of its own youth, than by any attempt to convert for that purpose the common day schools into denominational ones, and thus legislate for the neglect of duty on the part of pastors and parents of the different persuasions. The common day school and its teacher ought not to be burdened with duties which belong to the pastor, the parent, and the church. The education of the youth of the country consists not merely of what is taught in the day school, but also of what is taught at home by the parents and in the church by the pastor. And if the religious part of the education of youth is, in any instances, neglected or defective, the blame rests with the pastors and parents concerned, who, by such neglect, have violated their own religious canons or rules, as well as the express commands of the Holy Scriptures. In all such cases, pastors and parents are the responsible, as well as guilty parties, and not the teacher of the common school, nor the common school system.

7. But in respect to colleges and other high seminaries of learning, the case is different. Such institutions cannot be established within an hour's walk of every man's door. Youth, in order to attend them, must as a general rule, leave their homes, and be taken from daily oversight and instructions of their parents and pastors. During this period of their education, the duties of parental and pastoral care and instruction must be suspended, or provision must be made for it in connection with such institutions. Youth attending colleges and collegiate seminaries are at an age when they are most exposed to temptation—must need the best counsels in religion and morals—are pursuing studies which most involve the principles of human action, and the duties and relations of common life. At such a period and under such circumstances, youth need the exercise of all that is tender and vigilant in parental affection, and all that is instructive and wise in pastoral oversight; yet they are far removed from both their pastor and parent. Hence what is supplied by the parent and pastor at home, ought as far as possible, to be provided in connection with each college abroad. And, therefore, the same reason that condemns the establishment of public denominational day schools, justifies the establishment of denominational colleges, in connection with which the duties of the parent and pastor can be best discharged.

Public aid is given to denominational colleges, not for denomination-purposes, (which is the special object of denominational day schools,) but for the advancement of science and literature alone, because such colleges are the most economical, efficient and available agencies for teaching the higher branches of education in the country: the aid being given, not to theological seminaries, nor for the support of theological professors, but exclusively towards the support of teachers of science and literature. Nor is such aid given to a denominational college until after a large outlay has been made by its projectors in the procuring of premises, erecting or procuring and furnishing buildings, and the employment of professors and teachers—evidence of the intelligence, disposition and enterprise of a large section of the community to establish and sustain such an institution.

It is not, however, my intention to discuss the question of recognizing and aiding denominational colleges in a system of public