

municipal sources, and learn the part that can with greatest advantage be exercised by teacher and preacher.

Where church and school fully understand their respective functions, it is difficult to suppose that any just cause of antagonism can arise. The history of education is, however, so inseparably connected with the history of Christianity, and the latter so closely woven with church aggrandizement and the struggle for toleration, that contests have arisen, which, apart from such associations, might never have taken place. In Canada, we have begun to regard the absolute divorce of church and state as essential to the purity of the one, and the safety of the other. The principle has remained so long unconfirmed by the dominant practice of Christendom, that it can scarcely be regarded as an axiom. Whatever of vindication it has received has been through the sternest processes not only of logic, but also of arms. In its behalf it has demanded the sagacity of philosophers and the carnage of Lutzen. The struggle has not been so much with religion, as with church organizations. Mistaken notions on this question, are connected with the history of Philip II., the Falk Laws, and the late defeat of Mr. Gladstone. The spirit of toleration has been one of slow growth. Neither prelate nor presbyter, Claverhouse nor the Covenanters, are free from its unpleasant associations; and even the Puritans who crossed the Atlantic in the *Mayflower* were not imbued with consistent views on the question of religious freedom. The authority of the church has more than once clashed with the authority of the state; and with no subject have solutions of the difficulties occasioned been more perplexing than with that of education. With us, freedom of thought in religious matters has been secured by repeated enactment; but the assumptions of the church in secular affairs does not

belong entirely to the past. We have no established church; but the lingering remnants of the principle are still to be seen. It took a dozen years to abandon the appropriation of public funds for sectarian colleges after the settlement of the Clergy Reserves question. We give no such support now; but we give what is more than an equivalent. Our Legislature refuses to give a dollar to assist any denominational college; but it gives the power of conferring degrees, which is far more potent in "drawing" students. We look upon the matter of examinations for teachers, and for the professions, as too important a question to be relinquished by the state; yet our university policy is a glaring proof of our inconsistency. The efforts of the Government to maintain a high standard of examinations are inoperative, in consequence of the "one horse" system, as a learned writer terms it, to which the country has been committed. The Education Department controls by careful examinations the granting of certificates for First, Second, and Third-class teachers, yet a degree from any University qualifies for head master or assistant master in a High School; head master of a Public School, or county or city Inspector. What would be thought of a system that would allow each High School and Collegiate Institute to pass its own students at the Intermediate Examinations? "The quality of mercy" would in all probability come into extensive practice; but the value of certificates would suffer a serious depreciation. Can a principle that would be unsound in the case of Second and Third-class certificates have any defence when extended to the examinations for higher positions? Why allow a church to determine the necessary examinations in the one case, if not in the other?

Since neither the Reform nor Conservative party has, within the last