

decade, favoured state aid to denominational schools and colleges, and since increased and increasing liberality has been shewn in supporting the national institutions, it is quite evident the country has declared itself in favour of unsectarian education. That decision is wise, or the reverse. If wise, the actions of the different denominations should tend to increase the usefulness of the national schools; if unwise, the adherents of the various churches should, as citizens, use every means to break up our system, and hand over the work of education to the different religious bodies.

Our school system has been applauded on all hands. Every religious denomination has patronised, more or less, our national University. Among the warmest supporters of our national institutions have been many of the clergy of various churches. The highest confidence has been expressed in the moral tone of our schools. The amplest provision has been made, by numerous regulations, for securing religious instruction by ministers of various denominations, and yet the policy pursued by some would indicate that the "usefulness" of the state institutions, in their opinion, "is gone," and unsectarian education a failure.

If the state performs its assigned work in a proper manner, no church has any necessity to undertake a responsibility, and perform duties, that pertain to the Government and the Legislature. The state neither does nor can make provision for the theological training of the ministers of religion. That duty is incumbent upon the churches themselves; beyond this work, the church should not go in the matter of education. It is no more the province of a church to build colleges, than to build post-offices. It is no more the function of a religious denomination to train—as some are doing—doctors, lawyers, and teachers, than it is to train masons and black-

smiths. For a church to pay a professor to lecture on Dynamics, or Geology, is a departure from its legitimate sphere, as much as to pay the salary of the printer who instructs his apprentices. That a religious body may, under certain circumstances, be obliged to do work of this kind, I admit. The circumstances are only to be found where the state neglects its duty, and then prompt action should be taken by the members of churches, as citizens. We cannot as electors uphold what we condemn as members of religious denominations. If the national institutions are immoral, or irreligious, why should they be supported by our representatives in Parliament? Why defend our national system as citizens, and weaken its influence as adherents of churches? Why expend thousands of dollars annually in sustaining a Provincial University, and give it the cold shoulder as members of churches, and even tax ourselves as denominations, to build up rival universities, to perform similar work? If one body must have its university, why should not every other enjoy equal advantages? Who then are to patronise the State College? If each denomination must have its own university, the country should never bear the expense of one that is only attended by those who have no religion. Those who support denominational colleges should go a step farther. If sectarian control be good for the few, it is also good for the many; and nothing should be thought of by advocates of this kind but a complete surrender of education to the various churches.

It is only fair to acknowledge in this connection, that the Roman Catholic Church cannot be charged with inconsistency. That body has never conceded the right of the state to control education—our system, it has only accepted under protest. In accordance with its principles, it secured Separate Schools; and in the