

scamper homewards. Their name, we need hardly say, is not "legion." There are just about enough instances of this kind probably to "prove the rule" to perfection. Our close connection with Great Britain, the loving retention in Canada of the domestic and social traditions of "home," form a wholesome drag upon the wheels of irreligion here; but the *grade is all down*. Everybody feels that "religion has been shelved," to put in a very telling popular phrase: it is seen not to be in the regular routine, but can be "procured from the side-boards" if you please! "What's the use of it anyway?" is about the way the average boy or girl in America is disposed to question the utility of "religious exercises" generally, and *doctrinal teaching* in particular. It is no use to call upon the preachers or ministers at large to "avail themselves of" and "utilize" the opportunities of religious instruction afforded by the trustees of various schools. To spend their time in *trying* to produce some impression under the given circumstances is such an atrocious *waste* of time that no thoroughly conscientious and energetic clergyman will submit to the farce. The sooner our cousins south of the lakes recognize the fact that we have no such precious jewel of a system here, the better for themselves. Let there be no half measure! All English-speaking communities should fall into line with the prevailing Church sentiment in the Old Country, and stand shoulder to shoulder in a *plain demand* for the right of having Church schools, wherever the rates can be allocated sufficiently to pay the expenses required by the public system. Our clergy fought bravely years ago for "separate schools," and would have had them but for the treachery, or cowardice, or false liberality of so many Churchmen. The objection to "separate education" is purely senti-

mental—unworthy of full-grown men and women, gifted with a fair share of common sense. There need be no worse results from parallel sets of denominational schools than *wholesome rivalry*—if the line be carefully drawn where the question of adequate expense comes in. Every school should be equipped and taught up to a certain secular standard. The national conscience is being educated. Alongside of the downward stream of crime and criminality created by the lack of religious instruction in the public schools in any country, may be seen (thank God!) a *counter current* setting back towards the "old paths." For a while, our Canadian people were staggered, almost paralyzed, by the blow so successfully struck at Church schools thirty or forty years ago, but the generation has not passed in vain; it has carried into clear evidence the conviction that to do with "common" education when religious education can be had, is a grave crime against the soul and spirit that men possess. People feel more and more that it is worth a good deal to get their children educated where the influences, at least, and sanctions of religion, have an over-ruling authority to leaven and modify all else that is taught. Hence the triumph of "Church schools." Up and down our land there are schools started under Church auspices—carefully "feeling their way" at first—and after a while *flourishing*. This is true of boys' schools as well as girls', and it is true of *all types of Churchmanship*. It is true of every class of citizenship as low down as the fees can reach. People have to pay their taxes for the support of the "godless system," but they pay school fees besides rather than submit their children to the malign influences of a "common" school. The only question is, how low can the fees be brought and yet furnish enough to pay the way for the