

We are not among those who regard the union of Church and State as a sin. Probably this is the opinion of some of those who are, with very little consistency, pushing forward this particular feature of the University Bill. On the contrary, we regard the union of Church and State as the ideal thing, where it can fairly be had, and where it is a real union. But the intrusion of a secular State into the affairs of free Christian societies, is really something like an outrage, and this is substantially what is now being attempted.

The Ontario Government and the State University of Ontario—the University of Toronto—are professedly secular, and rightly so; they cannot properly be anything else. But then, assuredly, they have no right to meddle with religious matters, unless where religious bodies come into contact with the law of the State, or where those bodies ask for the legal enforcement of their constitutions or laws.

Nothing of the kind can be pleaded in the present case. No religious body has asked the Legislature or the Government of Ontario to make any provision for the conferring of degrees, such as has been introduced into the University Bill. As we are informed, more than one religious body have protested against it. In one case the protest has been very unanimous and energetic. In our present issue we publish a petition on the subject, addressed to the legislative body of the Province of Ontario, signed by four out of the five bishops of the Province, while the fifth, the Bishop of Huron, has signified his concurrence, although absence from home prevented him from signing.

We will not enter upon the whole contents of the manifesto, but will recommend its careful perusal to our readers, and more especially we beg to draw attention to the sixth clause of the petition. There it is stated, as a known fact, that the only College at present affected by the proposed provision, has already, by the presence of its representatives, on a committee appointed at the Provincial Synod, held last year, entered into an honourable agreement, to make an effort for a friendly settlement of this question. At the same time the Bishop of Montreal undertook that he would not consent to any proposal for proceeding further in the matter before the next triennial meeting of the Provincial Synod, and this agreement was supposed to bind all concerned. We cannot believe that, in the face of all these considerations and others urged in the memorial, the Legislature of Ontario will give its sanction to the proposed measure. Since the above was in type the obnoxious clause referred to has been withdrawn.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

A DESIRE for a closer union than at present exists between Christians is evidently felt by many earnest persons in our day. The Primate of Australia and Tasmania, in his address to the General Synod, spoke on the subject with much ability and sound judgment. As to the part which the Church of England

might take in promoting the cause of reunion, he suggested two leading thoughts: "First, she must be at peace—the peace not of uniformity but of unity—in herself. She must not be ashamed of the Protestantism which, whether it belong to her official phraseology or not, has ever since the Reformation meant the recognition of a right Christian individualism of religious liberty and responsibility. She must not be ashamed of what is usually called Catholicism—the recognition of a true corporate life in the whole Church, of continuity from the Apostolic times, and of a sacred though not absolute and infallible authority. She must not be ashamed of her old traditions of the free recognition of all natural human light and grace, of all true human ties and forces, as the ordinances of God, to be harmonised in a harmony of right subordination with the supernatural light and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is in virtue of this comprehensiveness that she may be able to offer various points for reunion, and to correspond, as we think, with the nature of humanity, and the dispensation of God. Next, if there is to be reunion, there must be no arrogation anywhere of an exclusive superiority; there must be the fullest practical recognition of the unquestionable fact that, in all sections of the Church and through all forms of the Christian ministry, the Holy Spirit has been working out the likeness of Christ and the will of the Father—that in the divided condition of the Church, irregularity must be distinguished from invalidity in Christian ordinances, and that the life of a reunited or federated Church must combine in its elements, under free liberty of variation, not from one or two of the divided sections, but from all. Before we can move, even by suggestion, on a path where one false step may bring irretrievable disaster, we must consider what must be the leading principles of all hopeful action."—*Church News for Diocese of Tasmania.*

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

WE take leave to ask the Minister of Education if he ever before heard or read of a Liberal Ministry in this or in any other country enacting a law, whose upshot, if not its intent, is to force a certain class in the community to contribute to denominational, rather than to State schools? In France, Italy, or Belgium, where recent events have clearly brought out the difference between Liberalism and Clericalism, Mr. Ross would be ranked amongst the obscurantists. The clause enabling the priest or any other third person to act as a discoverer against the parent before the assessor, is worthy of the Middle Ages.

During the election campaign the Minister of Education stated more than once, and the statement was re-echoed by Rev. Dr. Dewart and others, that one of the objects aimed at in the introduction of the Book of Selections was to make it suitable for Catholic children, fifty thousand of whom, it was said, were attending the public schools. Yet at the very time this strong argument in favour of the Selections were put forth, a regulation existed compelling teachers to dismiss Roman Catholic children during the Selections' exercise. Formerly every Roman Catholic child in at-

tendance at the Public schools was assumed, and very properly so, to be entitled to partake in all the exercises of the school, Bible-reading included. But later on Mr. Ross passed a regulation ordaining that every Roman Catholic child at the Public school should be turned out during the Selections' lesson unless the parent expressly notified the teacher that he desired it to hear the Selections read—a piece of legislation probably emanating from the same that devised the change already alluded to in the status of the parent himself. Mr. Ross has not yet attempted to account for the oversight that led him to set up for his expurgated Bible, a plea which had no foundation in fact. We are ready to suppose that when he told the deputation that the Provincial Teachers' Association had asked for a Book of Selections, he was guilty of nothing worse than a slip of the tongue. He knows, of course, that all the teachers asked for was a list of selections to be read from the Bible, which was to be affixed to the school register—a very different thing from an authorised compilation of selections. Further, we are quite prepared to accept Mr. Ross's word for it that his Grace Archbishop Lynch, who it will be remembered had the privilege of seeing the manuscript of the Selections, did not make or suggest any natural alteration in it, still less any brain suppression of verses or chapters. In a sermon recently delivered on the subject of the Selections, Rev. J. S. Cook, of Bluevale, undertook to show amongst other things (1) that the Selections are not what they were represented to be by those who favoured their adoption; (2) that many of the doctrines of Christianity, if taught at all, are not taught as distinctly as in the original Scriptures; (3) "that many of those Scripture passages which refute the errors of the Roman Catholic Church are omitted; many on which she bases her claims are given: thus an erroneous Church is better protected in the Selections than in the original Scriptures, and the teachings of Protestantism thereby less favourably represented." Mr. Cooke, who must have devoted great labour to his task, marshals a most impressive array of evidence in support of the last proposition. We think we are fairly entitled to ask Mr. Ross when next he undertakes to regulate religious teaching, to be a little more careful in his methods, and above all, to see that his Grace is not invited or permitted to interfere in matters which concern neither him nor his people. The new regulations brought down on Monday shew that the criticism directed against the old ones has brought forth fruit; and we are in hopes that public opinion may yet compel the Government to purge the statute book of the unjust separate school amendments, as well as to take measures for the protection of the Public school system from French aggrandizement. Had our rulers in times past been forced to govern for the State instead of being allowed to govern for the dominant Church, the country would not be in the unhappy plight it is to-day.—*The Mail.*

HOME REUNION NOTES.

THE circumstance, comparatively unimportant in itself, of the authorities of a Nonconformist congregation in London, having designated their Bible class a 'Guild,' has suggested to the *Daily Telegraph* matter for a lengthy and not uninteresting leading article. 'We have been accustomed,' says our contemporary, 'for now at least a generation, to see the Anglican borrow every characteristic of