

much better not to levy it by government interposition at all. Let each man keep his own money and teach his children what he likes. That is the fair result of such a system. But in the second place, we object to the government collecting or supplying funds to aid in turning school-houses into a heathen temple or sectary's chapel. The educational function of the Government is to educate citizens not sectaries.

2. There is a case where the large minority of a school section feel they must have their catechism taught to their children. They secede from the general school system and hire a teacher for themselves and get the benefit of their own taxes by assessment. Suppose the majority are Roman Catholics, and in the school all the tenets of the faith are taught. The minority are Presbyterian and they get a teacher who drills their children in the shorter catechism, or some worse one. Both these teachers draw from the treasury say \$120 a year for their services, in propagating their peculiar beliefs. Now, if this is a weak section, as in the majority of cases no section is strong enough to support two schools, it is a squandering of public money. It is likewise paying a premium for division in every section, for Wesleyans, Baptists, Episcopalians, Quakers, Universalists and others have a perfect right to do what Roman Catholics and Presbyterians do. And this is a great practical difficulty which has been met in Ontario and Quebec, than has been caused by the conscientious scruples of Roman Catholics in any section of our province under the present system. But our principle objection to endowing the majority on religious grounds is that it is really saddling us with the worst evils of church establishments without giving us any of their benefits.

3. There is the test case. There is one, or it may be, there are a few families living in a community where the great majority differ from them in religious beliefs. They are not able to make up the supplement necessary to secure a teacher. It is true we may suppose the case in our favor. The one family is Roman Catholic in the midst of a Presbyterian community. One school is in full blast under a thorough orthodox teacher. The Roman Catholic cannot send his child to that school to get the shorter catechism, John Knox and Luther thrust down his throat. He may get exemption from the local tax, as is the remedy provided in Ontario, but see he is deprived of the benefits of education, and is compelled to pay the general tax to propagate what he believes to be deadly error. Now this is just the case where government should protect the conscience. It is the weak that should be defended, not the strong. Our school system meets the case. It says you cannot provide a teacher for yourself, but we open a school where no positive error is taught. We guarantee that nothing will be done there to undermine the religious belief of your children, and yet they will get the education which will fit them for being good citizens, you can supplement that education with a religious training to make them good Christians if you like. Let us sum up thus: a separate school system will compel us and others to pay through the government taxes for the propagation of opinions that we regard as deadly error. It will tend to break up school systems unnecessarily. It will crush the conscience just at the very time when it needs protection. The great majority of our people believe that religious teaching is the work of the church, not of the state. Their conscience will be aggrieved if the taxes levied from them are appropriated to teach religious error in any form.

Our school system is and ought to be elastic enough to permit the full influence of the religious life of the teacher being exercised over the pupils. It ever provides for formal religious exercises, attendance upon which, however, are not to be compulsory.

But we are pointed to Ontario for a model to copy. We are asked to break up our educational machinery and reconstruct it after the Ontario