

schools of the old regime. Dr. King, himself, in 1892, affirmed his views as similar to those in the general assembly of 1880.

One member of the synod, the Rev. Dr. Bryce, fearing that somebody might think there was in the resolution of his confrere something in favor of secularizing the schools "which was not so" read from the act all the clauses providing for religious exercises in the schools, and to "prove that the synod ought to firmly and decidedly take a stand." The reverend speaker exhibited to the assembly a precious gem of the first sectarian water. People would hardly believe it, but the assertion was made in full synod and nobody was reported as having objected.

I beg pardon from the noble lords of the judicial committee in daring to quote the words of a most zealous champion of public schools, who in the midst of the synod of his church thought proper to say (The Winnipeg Daily Tribune, Nov. 23, 1892): "The action of the Presbyterian body as representing the strongest religious denomination in the Northwest in declaring for national schools on two previous occasions, which declaration was sent to the Privy Council, had an important effect upon the decision which was given." Were this affirmation made so solemnly, true, the judicial annals of Great Britain would have to record that the highest tribunal of the empire, under the pressure of the declarations of Presbyterian synods of Winnipeg, had given a decision contrary to the sacred interests of education among the Catholics of this province.

An Anglican synod met on the 11th January, 1893, in Winnipeg under the presidency of His Lordship the Bishop of Rupert's Land. The meeting numbered more than one hundred and twenty members, comprising the chief of the clergy and laity of the Church of England. The Right Rev. president delivered his charge, most of it being on the religious teaching in the primary schools. His Lordship expressed arguments and motives which are found in all Catholic treatises on the subject and substantiated by statistics. Here are quotations from the charge: "The known exclusion of religious teaching makes religion itself felt as something extra and superfluous. . . . Pure secular education has been accompanied by the deterioration of tone and character in the young. . . . The efforts to supply religious education independently of the school failed. . . . Religious instruction will be given systematically by few parents, not at all where most needed."

Speaking of "what would happen in England if the present assistance to separate schools were to cease," His Lordship described at the same time what would happen in Manitoba and says: "Many schools would be closed, many others would give but inferior education, still enough will be carried on, that a government

system of secular instruction might call itself national, but would be so in name not in reality." I have already stated that the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land, after having been for nineteen years the president of the Protestant section of the board of education, is since president of the advisory board for the public schools. He is consequently perfectly aware of the value of the religious exercises, prescribed by each of these two boards and here is the enumeration and appreciation made by His Lordship, "There is a short prayer concluding with the Lord's Prayer. There is a reading of a passage of the Bible. In the teaching of morals, there are the ten commandments." Now, these are not small things in themselves, but they are doubly important, because they carry with them, for the teachers, a degree of liberty." Yes, the bishop knows the value of what has been chosen and prescribed, under his presidency, for teaching the children of his church, as well as other Protestant children, and he adds: "The teachers who ignore these exercises can hardly be realizing their position as Christian men." After so speaking the president of the Anglican synod gave the following advice: "I think the synod would do well to pass a resolution, expressing the hope that there would be no interference with the present religious exercises," in public schools. The charge of the Metropolitan met with full approval and the committee appointed to report on it, presented the following:

"(2) Resolved, that while this synod would gladly see a larger measure of religious teaching in our schools than at present prevails, it trusts that every effort will be made, both by the educational authorities and by the Christian public generally, to render existing regulations on the subject as widely operative and efficient as possible."

"(3) This synod stands pledged to resist to the utmost any attempt to secularize our public schools."

The Rev. Canon O'Meara in proposing the adoption of the clauses of the report concerning religious education, reminded the synod that it is owing to the stand taken in 1890 "by the bishop and the Rev. Dr. King of the Presbyterian church that the intention to fasten upon the country an utterly godless system was changed."

The Rev. T. H. Walton seconded the motion. "He argued that in the interests of children, the state and the church, education should not be made purely secular." After that the metropolitan acknowledged that "when the parish schools were given up there seemed to be no doubt that there would be a certain amount of religious instruction in the (public) schools."

It is evident that the Anglican synod (1) repudiates the purely secular schools as dangerous to all; (2) that on the contrary