

a particular Church, of an age to be classed together, would be too few for the purpose. Then, unless the plan were generally adopted by, say, the leading denominations, the children of any Church that did endeavor to adopt it would rebel against being taught religion when their fellows were going on with school lessons, and still more if the rest were allowed to play during the time allotted to religious instruction. In a large parish, also, where is the staff of teachers coming from to give a half hour daily in some five or six, or possibly nine, buildings devoted to education? The clergy could not do it. In the town in which the writer resides there are four school buildings, and to give such instruction would, allowing for the time in going from one school to another, take at least three hours daily. The population is less than 3,000, and in towns of greater population the time needed would be still greater. Competent teachers would have to be provided, and this could not be done unless they were paid. Ratepayers would object to an increase of the rates for this purpose, and people who are now burdened to support their several churches would also object to increased demands upon them to support additional religious teachers. Such a plan would also be impracticable in scattered school sections in rural districts. Altogether, we fear this proposal, fair and plausible as it seems, would not secure the desired end. 4th. The last proposal, and we believe the only one that will secure adequate religious instruction, which is the only foundation of morals, and on which character can best be formed and developed, is that of recognition and aid by the State of voluntary or denominational schools. To all should be granted the privilege now enjoyed by the Roman Catholic Church in this province, of having schools in which they may teach their

children not a diluted, undenominational religion—much less schools in which religion is barely tolerated or altogether banished—but schools in which they can teach their children all that they ought to know and believe to their souls' health. It is invidious and unjust that one denomination should have rights and privileges denied to all others, and the subject will not down so long as this state of things continues. We would invite our Roman Catholic fellow subjects to join in demanding this change in the law, as the surest way to promote religious education, and, as we believe, the only way by which they can hope to retain the privilege they now enjoy. Education, like religion, is a subject on which people differ, and the State must take hands off unless it is prepared to recognize and to allow for the different views which prevail on this all-important question. The difficulty which has arisen in Manitoba, and which has extended all over the Dominion, would at once disappear if this broad and enlightened view of the question were to prevail. Let any given number of ratepayers have power to establish a separate and denominational school, subject of course to inspection, and guaranteed as to the efficiency of the teachers, in which they can have religion taught as they desire, and then, we believe, the school difficulty would be at an end, and till this is done, we believe the agitation will continue. This is what the Church of England is contending for in England, and what a considerable number, if not a majority, of Anglicans in Canada want. Nothing short of this will meet the necessities of the case, and for this we hope all true friends of religious education will contend till a Government is found here, as we hope Lord Salisbury's Government is, in the mother land, ready and willing to grant it.—*The Canadian Churchman*