

he thought the "only two questions in the case" were, Mr. Haldane, counsel for the respondents, conceded the "two points," "subject to the further question whether there was any question of interfering with the right and privilege of the minority." To which Lord Watson replied, "I do not know how that question is one for us." It is the non-settlement of this question by the Privy Council, which, according to their own view, they had no right to settle, that renders it both reasonable and right, as Mr. Laurier and Principal Grant both insist, that there should be "an investigation of the facts." As one who takes his stand against Separate Schools for the nation, which both the learned Principal and his reviewer seem to favor, I now wish to say a few words on the other part of "C's" communication. He says: "There is, however, one fundamental assumption involved in all the arguments of the opponents of Separate Schools and of religious education in Public Schools. It is wrong, they say, to tax the public at large for religion. Apparently it is not wrong to tax the public (who are mostly Christians) for irreligion."

It is that such a question as this, one that touches the deepest interests of the human soul and the most vital relations of human life here and hereafter, is involved in the Manitoba School Question, with the constitutional opportunity of sounding it to its very depths, and in whose settlement none can adequately measure or fully understand its far reaching consequences, that invests it with so deep an interest not only to all classes of citizens of this Dominion, but to thousands in other lands who are looking on to see what shall be our final placement of so serious and universally interesting a matter.

There ought to be, before dealing with so fundamental an aspect of the subject, some definitions of terms which are necessary in its discussion. What, for instance, is meant by the terms religion, religious education, secular education, morals as distinguished from religion and religion as distinguished from morals? In a single communication on the subject which I desire this to be, we cannot enter into the formal definitions of the above terms and the necessary accompanying discussions or reasons for them. But it will conduce to the elucidation of this subject, I think, to notice (1) that since the sending out of the Holy Spirit into the world at Pentecost, in a land such as ours where the gospel is preached so fully, earnestly and intelligently, such a thing as a purely secular school or education is impossible. We sometimes speak of men of skeptical or atheistical sentiments being dependent upon Christian influences for the moral character which they parade as a fruit of their peculiar notions. Does not this view of Christian influence apply with still greater force to an assembly of children whose parents are Christians and whose teacher and their own lives are mostly coming in constant contact with the institutions and influences of Christian homes, churches, ministers, Sunday Schools and Sunday School teachers? It would be still less possible for any school to be purely secular if under the influence and instruction of a genuine Christian morality. Then, Christian ethics are inseparable from the Christian religion. Surely a child can partake of the luscious clusters of the vine without first understanding the philosophy of their growth. So, too, it can be taught the beauty and sweetness of morality—the morality of Jesus—without being taught the theology that explains its origin and sustenance. Yet we distinguish between morals and religion, as we do between apples and an orchard. (2) Every school has its moral code expressed or understood. We either have or should have a definite moral code for our land. If as "C." says, "the public are mostly Christians," then certainly Christian morals should be our code. This very question that is before us to-day and is awaiting settlement, will be settled according to some code of morals. By what code shall it be settled? The eyes of the world are upon us. Let us act worthy of the ages to come. You cannot have a school without a moral code. That code should certainly be that of Christ. Say the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, and other precepts of Jesus. It is confessedly the best code. Put it in our schools and have the children repeat the Lord's Prayer in the morning and learn the whole by heart and repeat it at certain times in concert and separately. Require the teachers by law, so to teach it. Could anything be more honouring to the Head of the Church or to God? Let the Lord's, be the only prayer used. Nor

allow the teacher to give a single explanation except as to men's relations and duties to one another. If a child wants to know the meaning of a word, he should be sent to the dictionary for it.

(3) But, inasmuch as the Christian code of morals is the one that should govern the actions of the nation, form the basis of her laws, guide their administration and the ministrations of her justice, those who are to be her future citizens have a right to the fullest and best knowledge of that code for the sake of the national weal and the best citizenship.

Yet (4) I would not call these "religious schools" nor would I call them "secular schools." They would be neither; yet, they would combine both. They would not be denominational schools. If the teaching of good actions is more salutary in its influence (and this no intelligent teacher will doubt) on the child's life than the teaching of mere sentiments, then, from a religious and a national standpoint alike, the child would occupy great vantage ground. Jesus undoubtedly gave in His ethical teachings the literary statement of the principles and rules which governed His own life. Churches or denominations, it seems to me, should be very chary as to how far they reject this simple fundamental groundwork of education as a "sufficient and efficient" religious element in a system of schools that must be national, and which cannot, therefore, well be denominational. It is a matter of gratification that they can be Christian though non-denominational. And with a thoroughly well-defined code such as I have named, not too large, yet simple and having unquestionably the sanction of the Great Teacher, with the absolute requirement that every pupil should learn it by heart, the fundamental position which this element of education would occupy in our schools, would, on the moral side of their requirements, entitle them to be called Christian, while on the national side, they would be properly termed public schools.

And now, Mr. Editor, let me say, in the words of your able contributor, that I sincerely believe "it is wrong to tax the public at large for religion"—yea further, "for" the Christian "religion" as commonly distinguished from Christian morals; and should he term such moral teaching as I have described "irreligion;" then I would, in his own language, say also, "it is not wrong to tax the public (who are mostly Christians) for irreligion." But let me repeat "C's." language, substantially, as applied to another class, namely, the supporters, rather than the opponents of Separate Schools: "There is, however, one fundamental assumption in all the arguments of the supporters of Separate Schools and of religious education in public schools. It is right they say to tax the public at large for the distinctive tenets of all the sects of the Christian Church. Apparently it is not wrong to tax the public (who are mostly Christians) for the support of the denominationalism which each sect, except its own would be very apt to call unchristian." Perceiving the force of some such objection as this, he says: "In case of Separate Schools the objection does not apply," on the ground that the taxes of a particular denomination go only to the support of that denomination's religion. But in England, to-day both Romanists and Anglicans are asking for the support of teachers from the national revenues and from the local tax. It would soon be the case with us, and if more advantageous right enough, because the principle is the same in both cases. It is at once conceded that undenominational or purely Christian moral teaching is more difficult than denominational teaching. But difficulties are always greater as you ascend in the scale of life, until you come to the serenely simple elements common to all, "one touch" of which shows the universal kinship.

Let me now say that I quite understand that the main drift of the argument of "C." seems to be directed against "Jew, Turk, infidel or heretic;" but, unfortunately, he says the "one fundamental assumption" "is involved in all the arguments of the opponents of Separate Schools and of religious education in public schools." But the great denominations of our Christian faith will, or ought, not forget, as is not forgotten in the conscience clauses and other provisions in the present school laws of Ontario, Manitoba, and other Provinces, that an earlier and perhaps better type of Christianity than ours, commended "itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

CHARLES DUFF.

Toronto, Oct. 23rd.