

lics to secular education. We admit that religion ought not to be taught to children whose parents conscientiously object to the same. Are we prepared to say that more consideration is to be shown to those who disbelieve Christianity than to those who believe it?

But, let it be supposed, that the Separate Schools are abolished in Ontario, how shall we hope to preserve them in Quebec? It is quite true that there they are non-denominational. But the immense majority of the Lower Province are Roman Catholics; and it is quite possible, and not at all unnatural, that they should adopt a policy of retaliation, and punish the Protestants of Quebec for the misdoings of the Protestants of Ontario.

We can quite suppose that a Quebec politician would concede a conscience clause in their schools; and those who understand Roman, and especially Jesuit methods, will readily appreciate the value of such a safeguard for Protestant children in Roman Catholic schools.

How, then, is protection to be afforded to these Quebec Protestants, when those of Ontario have provoked the Roman Catholic population of the lower province to retaliation? The answer to this question, given by some of the Equal Righters, is certainly curious. If, they say, the Government of Quebec should do to the Protestants as the Government of Ontario is advised to do to the Roman Catholics, then the authority of the Dominion Government is to be invoked to set aside the provincial legislation! And this is gravely said; but is it possible to entertain the suggestion? Our recollection of the conflict on the subject of State Rights in the United States may warn us to keep clear of any such controversy among ourselves. A civil war is a very dreadful thing under any circumstances, and the man or the party who may undertake the responsibility of it will have no enviable place in history.

But if Separate Schools are not to go, then the doctrine of equal rights would teach that the application of the principle should be extended; and this is the common sense of the whole matter. It is also the practical outcome of the educational system in the Mother Country. Although no religious body is allowed to levy rates, yet large Government grants are paid for the support of the schools of the various denominations—which amounts to very nearly the same thing.

Are we, then, sanguine of the success of Dr. Langtry's proposal? If justice and common sense meant success, we should say, Yes, at once; and perhaps in the long run these may prevail in the present instance. But we have no expectation whatever of the near success of this effort, and the reasons for our conviction may easily be understood.

The Roman Catholics have their Separate Schools, and they will keep them, because they have faith in their own principles, and are united in the resolution to keep them. To them a compromise is impossible. The decrees of the Council of Trent, plus the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin and the Infallibility of the Pope—this is the Catholic Faith, and must be taught in its entirety, and shall be so taught. One can understand the success of such an enterprise.

What has Anglicanism in this country to correspond with it? In the first place, divided counsels; in the second place, a number of politicians who think the National System of Education a substitute for all the creeds, and thirdly, a number of people, divines and others, who think it better to

unite with other bodies in religious education than with their own Church.

Excellent Mr. Langtry, are these facts or fancies? If they are facts, you may as well "shut those eloquent lips of yours," or devote them to some more hopeful case.

#### CLERICAL INCOMES.

In the diocesan Synods, both of Toronto and Niagara, the subject of clerical stipends was brought up; but in both cases at such a late hour that the discussion could not be proceeded with. In the one case, the mover of the resolution himself declared that it would be useless to proceed with it in the present state of the house: in the other case another member of the house protested against the discussion of the subject with so small a number of members present. We think that the course pursued was right in the one case and wrong in the other.

The resolution brought before the Synod of Niagara involved the discussion of a number of points on which great differences of opinion exist, and which would have had to be discussed at length before any decision was arrived at; so that it was manifestly improper, in such a case, to proceed with the debate. At the Toronto Synod the resolution only called for a committee to consider the whole subject, and this might easily have been obtained even in a thin house. But apparently no one cared about it. The country clergy had nearly all gone home; and the city clergy had exhausted so much time and energy over the Rectory surplus that they had apparently nothing left in the way of sympathy for the needs of their rural brethren.

The amount of time expended over the Toronto dollars, and the wire-pullings of some of the persons interested, did not present an altogether beautiful spectacle to the eyes of gods and men. Some of the headings of these debates in the daily newspapers showed painfully the effects produced by them upon the reporter mind. This, however, must not be said without a reference being made to the generosity of one member of the clerical body. The Rev. Chas. Darling, Rector of S. Mary Magdalene, perhaps the very poorest parish in Toronto, put a stop to a threatened controversy and an impending scramble, by promptly declaring that he would give up one of the shares of his parish to another, that there might be no more controversy on that subject. If these statements should come under the eye of any wealthy Churchman who may have an appreciation of unselfishness, he will certainly do well to remember the needs of S. Mary Magdalene's church and clergy.

The mover of the resolution at Niagara spoke of the evil congregationalism, which seems to be spreading in the Church; and suggested that the stipends of the clergy should not be paid immediately by those among whom they ministered. We believe that some such arrangement was made in the diocese of Toronto; but we understand it was not acted upon.

The mover in the Synod of Toronto asserted, first, that many of the clergy had most inadequate stipends; secondly, that they did not receive the amount stipulated to be paid, and thirdly, that the sums which they received were paid most irregularly. He declared that he had credible testimony on these points from various parts of the country, and that he was also informed of the natural consequence, the clergy had no choice but to get into debt; and the Synod might imagine the ultimate effect of this state of things upon their ministrations.

It is quite obvious that there is need of some kind of sustentation fund, either in union with or distinct from the Mission Fund. If it is said that the lack of support experienced by the clergy, is very commonly the result of their own inefficiency or neglect, and that any fund in support of them would only be an encouragement to the slothful and incompetent, the answer is very simple. Whatever measures may be taken for the relief of the clergy should be accompanied by some organization for ascertaining the condition of the parishes and the reasons by which they might be accounted for.

Another year will probably pass before anything further can be attempted. Another year, to many, of suffering, of despondency, of decreased energy, is not a pleasant thought to Churchmen or Christians. Doubtless it will comfort some of the forgotten labourers in the distant parishes to know that the Toronto clergy have arranged their shares of the Rectory Surplus.

#### CHURCH COUNCILS.

Was it not Gregory of Nazianzus who said he had never seen any good come out of the assemblies of Bishops? S. Gregory was a slightly impatient kind of man, and had suffered a good deal at the hands of Bishops, and he may be forgiven. Still, it is quite true that some of those assemblies left a good deal to desire. Even without going to that famous one at Ephesus, we may sometimes covet a trifle more of decorum.

Yet we imagine that they were a good deal more interesting than our modern gatherings of clergy and laity, which are seldom disturbed by the passionate scenes which were tolerably common in those early days. We are not now in danger of being consumed by fire, but only of being asphyxiated by gas—a less painful death, no doubt; yet not a pleasant one, and with a touch of ignominy in it.

That was a remarkable scene in the Parliament House at Westminster, when the Lord Protector appeared before the astonished Commons, and in unmistakable tones bid them be gone, as he, Oliver Cromwell, and the country, England, had no more need of them, were weary of them, and must put an end to their prating. And there have been minds to whom that scene has appeared by no means unpleasant to contemplate. It is reported of the late Mr. Carlyle, that on one occasion he was passing the Houses of Parliament in company with Lord Wolseley, when he turned and pointed to the House of Commons with the pregnant remark: "I hope, sir, the day may come when you will lock the door of that house and put the key in your pocket."

This was going too far; and probably Carlyle himself was not perfectly serious in making such a proposal. None knew better than he did, that however badly the Parliaments of Charles I. and the Commonwealth behaved, the King and the Protector equally defeated their own ends by endeavouring to rule without them. Still it is not merely the cynic and the hero-worshipper, and Carlyle was a good deal of both, who grow impatient over the chaos of our modern representative assemblies; but many wise, sober, judicious men are beginning to doubt whether we are not on a wrong path in the constitution of our legislative assemblies. Even a man of the eminence of Sir Henry Maine has declared that he should prefer a King's Council to the present state of things.

The English House of Commons, at the present moment, must lead many persons to entertain similar views; and our own ecclesiastical meetings