CHURCH AND SCHOOL IN SCOTLAND.

THE population of Scotland, by last census, amounted to 2,870,784; but in the statements which we are about to submit, we shall assume, with Lord Melgund, that it amounts, in round numbers, to 3,000,000. Such a population would involve 600,000 children between the ages of five and fifteen; but the existing educational machinery overtakes, at the utmost, only 300,000, leaving a similar number to grow up in ignorance and degradation. This result is arrived at from the following data:

	Number of Schools.	Number of Pupils.
Parish Schools	833	74,000
Supplementary Do.	200	16,800
Assembly Schools	125	15,000
Total Church of Scotland . . .	1,158	105,800
Free Church	816	65,000
Total Established and Free Churches	1,974	170,800
To avoid under-statement, let the pupils in connexion with these two bodies be regarded as amounting, in round numbers, to . . .		200,000
And for attendance at other schools, add . .		100,000
		300,000

Three hundred thousand children, at the very utmost, are all that, at the present moment, are in the act of being educated in Scotland, leaving 300,000, or, to make sure that there is no exaggeration, leaving 200,000 children that do not know one letter from another, and who are, and likely will continue to remain, beyond the humanising influence of the schoolmaster. Two hundred thousand children at this very moment growing up amongst us in all the darkness of heathenism—walking the streets in rags by day, and wallowing by night amongst filth, disease, and poverty and death. Two hundred thousand children who have not been taught honesty, who are not allowed to beg, and who when they steal are scourged, imprisoned and banished, and who, in a fair proportion of cases, can see the gallows as the terminal point of their sad career. Two hundred thousand children, many of them born in sin, most of them reared in iniquity, and all of them revelling in ignorance and barbarism. The State that does not educate should not punish. Where children have no parents, or where they have parents who will not or cannot teach them the cardinal elements of knowledge and morality, the State should interfere and assume the parental functions. It is the duty of the State theoretically, and it is the best policy of the State practically.

Why, then, is there not a national system of education in Scotland, to overtake the culture of the masses?

The simple reason is, that the Established Churchmen, the Free Churchmen, and the Secular Educationists cannot agree as to the precise model after which the national system is to be fashioned. Very unfortunately, too, the three belligerent parties are about equal in political influence, and the simultaneous agitation of the subject by one or other of them invariably leaves it precisely where it was before. In fact, they form a complete resolution of forces. Let the three be represented by the three sides of an equilateral triangle, and let national education be the object in the centre; whenever one begins to exercise its tractile power the others do the same, and there is an end of progress. The Established Church, if we may be permitted the use of an anomalous phrase, is passively active. It does not originate aggressive movements, but it holds on with iron grasp when any attempt is made to modify the educational institutions of the country in conformity with the spirit of the age. The Free Church is positively active; but when it attempts to take into its own hands the education of the country, the Establishment resists in one direction and the Secular Educationist in another, and matters come at once to a stand. The Seculars are also movement-men, but when they, in turn, stretch forth their hands, bond and free exert *their* sinews, and again the lock process takes place.

It is high time that these gladiator contests were terminated. Whilst the combatants are indulging in these passes at arms, Thuggism waxes rampant, and souls and bodies are being lost. The country is becoming tired of mere questions of precedency; the subject is important, the danger imminent, and the necessity for earnestness immediate and absorbing. Let us, therefore, inquire into the differences that exist regarding this matter; dealing calmly, but firmly and candidly, with the three rival parties.

And first of all we shall address ourselves to the parish schoolmasters, as representing the Established Church.

The glory of the Scotch parochial system consists in its affording a certain minimum amount of instruction for the population. Be the parish large or small, each has its school, where the rudiments not only of an English education, but of classical and mathematical learning, can be ably and economically communicated. This, with a similar provision for religious instruction on the part of the clergy, forms the moral parochial machinery of the country, and that it has been productive of much benefit is undeniable; but that Church and school, both or either, have raised Scotland to its present industrial or commercial position is a mere figure of speech that will be received as gospel only in Church courts or at presbytery dinners. Deeper investigation would show that climate, trade, the union with England, the national system of banking, and other causes have been at work in raising North Britain to its present position. We recognise the minister and schoolmaster as elements, most important elements, in laying the foundations of their country's strength; but let them not claim all the glory, for assuredly the world will not give them credit for it.

We know the parochial schoolmasters of Scot-

land well. They are an intelligent, hard-working, under-paid class of individuals. Many amongst them are fitted to fill the most prominent educational stations in the land, and their average character is highly respectable. We wish to see them remunerated in proportion to their labour, and to the importance of the office which they hold; but they must bear with us when we say that the concession must not be all on one side. If the country is to pay higher salaries, the schoolmaster must somewhat conform to the wishes of a generation which, in the very act of being willing to remunerate more liberally, demonstrates that it has greater real respect for the teacher and his office than those conservative lights of a past day who fixed their incomes at their present miserable amount, and to whom, notwithstanding this pregnant fact, the schoolmasters cling as unto household gods. The pedagogic mind is constitutionally in favour of the let-alone system. Sir Walter Scott says of Reuben Butler, that "the man was mortal, and had been a schoolmaster." The training, the routine of official duty, seclusion from society, and other similar influences, nay, their very poverty, clinging to them as with the tenacity of fatality, all tend to rivet the opinions and practices of the instructor in narrowness and prejudice. The clergy also have done what in them lay to retard school-reform. However they may attempt to deny it, the fact is undoubted that their zeal in this matter is more for the Church than the school, more for the clergyman than the preceptor. In one word, the cloth look to the parish schools not so much as national seminaries of learning, but as outposts of their own establishment. "No bishop, no king," was a maxim of King James; and "No school, no Church," seems to be an equally favourite although not avowed principle with our modern Presbyterian divines. The Church is regarded in the light of an ancient fortress; the parish schools are reckoned one wall of defence, and university tests as another, and the Church looks with a jealous eye on any attempts to alter, amend, or improve them; and this entirely from a mistaken conception that they form part and parcel of her constitution, and from the equally mistaken apprehension that if college and school were more thoroughly nationalised the Church would thereby be weakened. As we have begun with architectural illustration, we may as well follow out the analogy. The ancient baronial castle had its moat, drawbridge, portcullis and bastion; its donjon keep and its gallows-tree; its hundred retainers, with their pikes, and swords, and guns, and all the other paraphernalia, animate and inanimate, of attack and defence. But whoever dreams of such adjuncts in a modern aristocratic domicile? What are the defences of Balmoral? Our common-sense Queen barely tolerates the protection of the soldiers and policemen who are sent to guard her Highland home. The military are drafted off to a village at some miles' distance, and the handful of police, instead of mounting guard, sleep soundly in out-houses. And so it should be with the Church. If she is strong in her resolves regarding the religious instruction of the people, she may safely leave scientific and popular education in other hands. For the first, she has done nothing, literally, emphatically nothing; and for the second, if she continues to maintain her present attitude, she will do more damage by her retardment of imperative measures than her previous efforts in the cause may be able to atone for. The Church altogether mistakes her functions in regard to secular education. She cannot have greater responsibilities regarding the children of the State than the actual parents of these children have; and yet no one expects that every father is to teach his child to write, or to read, or to cast accounts, in *proprid personâ*. The parent is bound to give his children moral and religious instruction, and so is the clergyman; but to do this it is not necessary that either should interfere with the school-room. This, however, is anticipating an argument that belongs to an after-stage; and we must, in the mean time, return to the case of the parish schoolmasters, and deal with them as a class directly interested in this question.

Well then, gentlemen, what have the lairds and ministers of Scotland done for you? In 1803, in the palmy days of good old constitutional George the Third, when Liberalism was at a discount, these same lairds and ministers concocted and passed an "Act for making better Provision for the Parochial Schoolmasters, and for making Regulations for the better Government of the Parish Schools in Scotland;" 43 Geo. III. cap. 54. The preamble runs thus: "Whereas the parish schoolmasters in Scotland are a most useful body of men, and their labours have been of essential importance to the public welfare," but hitherto their salaries, as fixed in the reign of William III., have been from one hundred to two hundred merks Scots (the latter, 11*l.* 2s. 2⅔d. sterling), "which, by difference," here we resume our quotation, "in the value of money and change in the circumstances of the country, has become a provision altogether inadequate for a body of men whose labours are of so great public utility: may it therefore please your Majesty that in future they shall not receive less than three hundred merks or more than four hundred merks per annum," which, being translated, means respectively 25*l.* 13s. 3⅓d. and 34*l.* 4s. 4½d. sterling. But, in addition, the lairds were to provide dwelling-houses for the "useful body of men whose labours were of so great public utility," and on this head Section VIII. is worthy of being quoted.

"And be it further enacted, that in every parish where a dwelling-house for the residence of the schoolmaster has not already been provided, together with a portion of ground for a garden, the heritors of every such parish shall provide a *commodious* house for the residence of the schoolmaster, such house *not consisting of more than two apartments including the kitchen*, together with a portion of ground for a garden to such dwelling-house from fields used for the ordinary purposes of agriculture or pasturage, which garden shall contain at least one fourth part of a Scots acre .... providing always, that where the heritors shall determine that such garden cannot be allotted to the schoolmaster without great loss and inconvenience, it shall be optional to them, with the

authority of the quarter sessions of the county or stewartry, to assign to the schoolmaster, in lieu of such garden, an addition to his salary at the rate of eight bolls of oatmeal per acre." Reckoning oatmeal at eighteen shillings per boll, its present price, and supposing the garden allowed, but not obtainable, to be of the extent of a quarter of an acre, the money equivalent would be somewhere under two pounds.

We do not say that the heritors of Scotland have literally acted on the letter of this statute—on the contrary, they have, in numerous instances, exceeded the statutory provision for the schoolmaster; but still here is an Act passed in 1803 by the good old constitutional Tories, who, at county dinners or Protection banquets, are ready to shed tears when the labours of the parish schoolmaster are mentioned—an Act passed in 1803, when President Hope was lord-advocate and Blair was solicitor-general, when Addington was premier and Lord Eldon chancellor, and when Pitt, Wyndham and Canning were in all their glory—an Act passed by men who, while recognising the parish schoolmasters as "a most useful body of men, whose labours were of essential importance to the public welfare, and whose provision was altogether inadequate," enacted that their salaries should not exceed 34*l.* 4s. 4½d., and that, compulsorily, their residences should not consist of "more than two apartments including the kitchen!" Well might the "most useful body of men" exclaim, "Save us from our friends!"

But having admitted that the heritors have not confined themselves to the letter of their own law, it may be concluded that the voluntary liberality of the landlords of Scotland has atoned for their niggardliness in formal legislation. Whether it have done so or not may be gathered from the statements of the schoolmasters themselves. In a document presented to Mr. Rutherfurd, the late lord-advocate, they gave in their average incomes as under:—

	£	s.	d.
Salaries	28	6	4
Fees	19	15	9
Houses and gardens ...	5	0	0
Average annual income ...	£53	2	1

How, then, do the schoolmasters contrive to subsist on such a miserable pittance? They eke out their scanty incomes by the performance of other than professional duties. Mr. Rutherfurd had a controversy with them regarding his Marriage and Registration Bills, and on his motion a return was ordered by the House of Commons as to the extraneous offices held by parish schoolmasters. This document showed that, of 883 persons holding the office of schoolmaster,

710 were Session Clerks,
426 „ Poor-law Inspectors,
193 „ Collectors of Rates,
134 „ Clerks to Heritors;
261 held other appointments.

At the time some outcry was made about these pluralities, and jokes passed current about their being—

> Parish-clerk and sexton too,
> Like ancient Caleb Quotem.

But we have no sympathy with such sarcasms. Public functionaries having wives and children, and "most important duties to perform," and all for a legal remuneration of 53*l.* 2s. 1d., are quite entitled to become pluralists. "Their poverty, not their will, consented;" and until men are paid *adequately* for their labours, no one has a right to talk about pluralism.

But the worst remains to be told. The parish schoolmasters cannot depend either on their *minimum* salary of 25*l.* 13s. 3⅓d., or on their *maximum* of 34*l.* 4s. 4⅓d. Section III. of the Act runs thus: "And be it enacted, that the salaries so fixed and determined in manner above directed shall continue to be the salaries payable to the schoolmaster of every parish for and during the period of twenty-five years from and after the passing of this Act; and within three years after the expiration of twenty-five years from the passing of this Act, the sheriff or stewart of every county or stewartry shall fix and determine, according to the average amount of the fairs of the county or stewartry for the twenty-five years preceding, what is the value or average price of a chalder of oatmeal .... which average so ascertained shall be the rate according to which the schoolmaster's salary shall be fixed." Section VI. enacts that this process shall be repeated every twenty-five years in perpetuity, with this provision, however, that "such salary shall never be less than the value of one chalder and a half nor more than two chalders." We are not certain at what time the scrutiny took place for the five years ending 1828, or if, indeed, it took place at all; but a second investigation falls due in 1853, and from the depreciation in grain prices consequent on the repeal of the Corn-laws, there can be no question that the salaries of the parish schoolmasters will sink below their present level, humble as it is. The guarantee of a *minimum* of one chalder of oatmeal will afford but sorry protection; for reckoning, as we have already done, the present price of that commodity at eighteen shillings per boll, and giving sixteen bolls to the chalder, the result would, according to the existing state of the markets, admit of a *minimum* salary of 14*l.* 8s. This is an impending state of matters which our friends the schoolmasters would do well to look boldly in the face; and they need not imagine that because neither Lord Melgund nor Dr. Candlish have carried their bills, therefore the influence of the two parties headed by the noble lord and the reverend divine is to be regarded as trifling and treated accordingly. Every one conversant with parliamentary tactics knows that a party or parties unable to carry a measure are yet perfectly able to obstruct the measures of their opponents. And the parish schoolmasters may lay their account with this, that no Ministry, be it Protectionist or Peelite, will be able to raise their salaries, or even keep them at their present figure, without making concessions of some kind on the constitution of the present parish schools. Let us, then, in a friendly spirit proceed to discuss some of those plain questions which must inevitably be mooted at no distant period.

Why should the parish schools be tied neck and

heel to the Established Church? At the period when the present tie between Church and school was formed, the Presbyterian establishment was nearly the universal Church of the people, Papist and Prelatist being in small minorities. But now the aspect of affairs is entirely changed; the Establishment cannot be said to comprise more than one-third of the church-going population; and the question naturally occurs, why Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians, who hold by Calvinism as strongly as their established brethren, should be excluded from the office of parish schoolmaster, humble in emoluments as that office may be? This is the political and social bearing of the controversy. "I pay taxes," says the Nonconformist. "I am as loyal, as well educated a Presbyterian, if not more so, than my established brother; why, therefore, should I be doomed to teach a hedge-school on the voluntary principle, looking to my own pockets or those of my neighbours for the means of building and maintaining school and school-house?" Except the mere circumstance that the arrangement has received parliamentary sanction, we can see no ground on which it can otherwise be justified—and we need hardly add, that in these days the simple fact of Act of Parliament support does not carry much weight, unless it is evident that the dictates of justice and common-sense have been duly consulted by those who concocted the statute.

Probably we shall be told that the present connexion between Church and school secures the teaching of religion in the latter; but we are strongly of opinion that the religious teaching of the parish school, and of all elementary schools, has been very much over-rated. The mild precepts of Jesus may be taught by a parent whose children sit before him at the happy fireside, or they may be inculcated by the watchful mother who sits by the couch of her sick boy; or, lastly, they may be enforced by the venerable pastor at his annual visitation; but we must be excused if we hesitate to admit that the decalogue, or the proof catechism taught under the fear of the uplifted cane or *tawse*, ever has or ever will do much in the way of teaching religion. It is the merest dry-bones and husks of theology that can be taught at school. Besides, it is the duty of the clergy to teach religious knowledge, and not the schoolmaster. Personally, all men are bound to do good as they find opportunity; parents are under the highest obligations to train their offspring religiously; the clergy, in point of responsibility, follow next, and after them may come the schoolmasters; but, professionally, if we are to attach any meaning to the words of the Saviour, as addressed to his Apostles, the moral and religious culture of the young is the duty of the pastor and not of the teacher. And let not this be esteemed any hardship; the clergy, in point of numbers, are about equal to the schoolmasters, and by undertaking this interesting and important duty, the clergy would be the means of removing the great bone of contention that now retards the cause of education and hinders its development in a national form.

As to educational efficiency in connexion with the Established Church, it were ludicrous to refer to it. The improvements of latter years are due to the spirit of the times and the efforts of the schoolmasters themselves; but assuredly, except to a very small extent, little credit is due to the ecclesiastical element. When a school is vacant, the parish minister has the virtual patronage, and by his advice the heritors present, then the presbytery examine, the presentee, and thereafter annually inspect his school. But we put it to those who know the system, if the preliminary examination and all the subsequent annual visitations of schools are not, with very few exceptions, dry, formal and useless ceremonials. The Church has two excellent normal schools, but she has not made attendance on them obligatory; and when the parish schoolmasters, in common with their brethren of the Educational Institute, sought to make their diploma the passport to all public appointments, did not a northern Synod rise in arms, and the whole Church look on with jealousy? Lawyers have the training of lawyers, artists of artists, physicians of physicians; but, till of late, teachers were taught—nobody knew how. Then, discerning their true position, teachers, like other professional men, sought to purify their order by granting certificates of comparative merit. But has the Church done anything to encourage this movement? It has not; and with its present views never will. It is, therefore, for the teacher to assert the independence of his office. Minister and schoolmaster should co-operate with each other; but the one should not be dependant on the other. Each office has its appropriate functions, and in moving in their respective spheres they should and ought to be help-meets to each other; but Church should not attempt to lord it over school.

One result of the present system of education in Scotland is, that every sectarian school that plants its standard within hail of the parish school is regarded as a rival institution; but this mainly arises from the circumstance that alterations in the body-politic have caused the parish school to cease being national and to have become denominational itself. We acquit the teachers of any intention of wishing to proselytise; but in the divided state of opinion that now prevails in the country, people will assert that establishments whose heads must be members of a given Church, and who must teach under the superintendence of that Church, have a natural tendency to become sectarian. Just now, schools are to be found in clusters where they are not required, and are thinly strewn where they should be plentiful; and this result will be found to obtain until the State puts out its strong arm and rigidly acts on the principle that all seminaries receiving public money, whether in the shape of taxation from heritors or grants from the Privy Council, must observe such laws of geographical distribution as shall secure the general instruction of the whole population.

We are aware that the parish schoolmasters are frightened at the idea of local boards, and that they are apprehensive that, like a petty inquisition, they would interfere materially with personal comfort and the freedom of professional action; but before being alarmed at these anticipations, we would

have the schoolmasters to consider the nature of the statutory restrictions that are presently laid upon them. By Sections XVI. and XXI. of the Act already referred to, they are subject to the jurisdiction of the presbytery of the bounds, without power of appeal to any court, civil or ecclesiastical; and as it is possible that none of the clergymen composing that court may ever have been a schoolmaster, they may be entirely at the mercy of an unprofessional tribunal. Then, by Section XVIII., the heritors and minister may fix school-fees; by Section XX. presbytery may regulate hours of teaching and length of vacation; and, worst of all, by the former of these sections the schoolmaster shall be obliged to teach such poor children of the parish as shall be recommended by the heritors and minister at any parochial meeting—a power which might be exercised to a very arbitrary extent. It may be that these clauses have not been acted on, and that, practically, they have fallen into desuetude; but still, in estimating the force of the objections that have been urged against a national system, it is but fair to remind our friends that by law they do not possess such an amount of liberty as should make them afraid of impending changes.

But whilst making this statement, we desire to have every sympathy with a class of men who very properly desire to maintain the independence and dignity of their calling. We would therefore have the teacher to be placed beyond the control of petty surveillance. Let the local boards decide as to school-house and dwelling-house for the teacher, conform, of course, to some recognised and uniform mode of procedure; let them decide on all matters regarding assessment, and let them elect the teacher; but let them go no further. Qualified inspectors should report from time to time as to the character of the teaching; and all complaints against the teacher should be referred, in the first instance, to the inspector, whose duty it would be to report thereon to some judicial authority. Lord Melgund's bill proposed that the power of censure, suspension, or deposition, should be intrusted to the sheriff of the county; but on the principle that all professional bodies should be self-governing, we would propose that this power should be vested in a board of teachers chosen by their brethren at large, subject to the approval of the Crown. The decision of such a board we would have to be final, just as the ecclesiastical sentences of the General Assembly are absolute in the case of erring ministers.

Nay, such is our desire for the amicable adjustment of this momentous question that, if it would secure their co-operation, we would have the existing staff of schoolmasters to remain in connexion with the Church, precisely as they are so connected at the present moment, allowing the new arrangement to come into operation only as vacancies occurred by death or removal. With the announcement of this concession we take leave of the parish schoolmasters, trusting that we have given them some ground for supposing that Radical Tait is not so very much their enemy as they may hitherto have been in the habit of imagining.

We now come to the Free Church. When that active body separated from the Establishment in 1843, some eighty parish schoolmasters resigned their schools and cast in their lot with the new ecclesiastical organisation. With a natural sympathy for these parties, new schools and dwelling-houses were procured for them; and then followed, or perhaps simultaneously sprang up with this, the conception of planting schools in parishes where the teacher remained attached to the old parochial economy. A new Church, led on by energetic leaders, backed by popular applause, and having national aims and objects, was very likely to chalk out as one of its enterprises a comprehensive scheme of education; and the 816 schools which it presently has in operation is a proof of the success which has attended its mission in this department. But an unendowed Church, having large designs to accomplish and nothing to look to for carrying them into execution but its own internal resources, must needs be cautious in its operations. First of all, the Free Church built places of worship for their congregations, then manses for their clergy, then cottages for their students, then schools and dwelling-houses for their teachers, and then premises for their missionaries. And when all this was done, only one-half of the warfare was accomplished. There must be monthly gatherings for the support of the clergy, monthly gatherings for the teachers, monthly gatherings for the missionaries, annual collections for colleges—to say nothing of Jewish schemes, John Knox's house, normal schools, and dozens of other objects to which the willing Free Churchmen have gladly contributed, till, after eight years of voluntary ecclesiastical taxation, to an extent unparalleled in the annals of the Christian Church, her adherents are now disposed to turn round and say, "Hold! enough!" The vessel tosses heavily, something must be cast over-board to lighten and relieve the labouring bark, which, now fairly launched on the open sea, must be kept in good working order if she is to make head-way at all. Of her many projects the education-scheme is destined to go first by the board. In working a pump, every one knows that a symptom of disorder is a certain ominous cachetic sound that emanates from the interior. We are not cunning enough in hydraulics to aver whether this lugubrious melody arise from decadence of water, or from an abnormal state of the piston; but this we know from experience, that after its music is heard the functions of the machine will sooner or later be at an end. This is the state of the education-fund of the Free Church, the broken-winded *valé* is there, the asthmatic inspirations cannot be mistaken. With all the aid from Government in the erection of schools, dwelling-houses, and in supplementary salaries, and it has not been small, the Free Church teachers are miserably off, being sunk in deeper penury than the parish schoolmasters.

Dr. Candlish has from the first been the prime mover, as he still continues to be the chief upholder, of the Free Church schools. The enterprise is worthy of his great powers of endurance, but he will not carry the day, and should esteem discretion the better part of valour. Let him look around

and examine his position. Dr. Chalmers left the field evidently impressed with the idea that the Church should not burden herself with a matter which the State is equally bound, and better able, to perform. Dr. Chalmers' opinions are held by not a few influential laymen and clergymen, and although they have not yet mustered strong in Church courts they are vigorous out of doors, and will one day knock at Tanfield in tones that cannot be mistaken. On the other hand, and directly opposed to this section, are the out-and-out ecclesiastical educationists who reject Government grants; the men who would rather want education if not of the Free Church dye; the men who would have dancing, algebra, Hindustani, gymnastics, and navigation taught in direct connexion with the catechisms, larger and shorter, and the Protest and Deed of Separation of 1843. Dr. Candlish never will march through Coventry with these liberal-minded gentlemen, and he should unhesitatingly abandon them to their fate. The Free Church *plant*, if handed over to the nation, would be a noble contribution to the cause of popular education. But the Free Church must wait till Government seeks its aid. This is a do-nothing age, and we are at present blessed with a do-nothing Government, who will fold their arms and go to bed if not stirred and kept awake. The Free Church should say boldly that it is not called on to perform a duty plainly incumbent on the State. "In more remiss times (for national education is making strides every year), we undertook this duty—the fruits of our labour are to be found scattered over the whole country. Let the country give us a guarantee that those schools will be faithfully and efficiently devoted to the purposes for which we intended them (viz., the education of the people), and we resign all claim over them." Let the Free Church come forward and do this, and she may claim and will receive an influential position in the settlement of the question.

We now come, last of all, to the secular educationists. There are two weak points in their case, which, dealing with them as we have done with their antagonists, we shall freely point out. They have excellent theories on the subject of national education, but what have they actually done in the way of putting those theories into practice? We see the parish school in every parish, and the Free Church in almost every parish, and we see the United Presbyterian school in a few parishes; but, except Mr. Combe's solitary seminary, where do we find the secular school? If the seculars have had faith in their principles, why have they not put their hands into their pockets, as their rivals have done, and given visible evidence of the sincerity of their views? The mere allocation of schools erected by others does not afford such a proof of earnestness as the creation of schools by ourselves. Then, again, we do not think that the seculars make sufficient allowance for the prepossessions, or, as they would call them, the prejudices, of the adherents of the Established and Free Church school systems. With "bond and free," the Bible and Catechism have from time immemorial been associated with popular education —not only associated, but positively incorporated and interwoven with school tuition. It is not, therefore, surprising if they should look with a jealous eye on any proposal to dissever them. The Free Church says, We will teach Bible and Catechism, but will compel none to learn them against their inclination; the seculars say, We do not undertake to introduce Bible and Catechism, but if local board and teacher agree we will not exclude them. With all deference, this is trifling. There is but a step between the two parties, and it were childish in both if they longer keep nibbling at such trifles; we say trifles in so far as the difference between the opposing parties is compared with the magnitude of the cause that is retarded.

We have stated that there are three parties interested in this question. Not one of them is able, single-handed, to defeat the other two. Cannot two of them so see eye to eye that they may be able to carry the day? We have given our contribution towards the solution of the problem, and shall watch the progress of events and report at a future period.

LITERATURE.

Golden Dreams and Waking Realities. By WILLIAM SHAW. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1851.

IT would be well if ingenuous youths of desultory and roving habits, and who imagine themselves capable of everything in general, because utterly deficient in any particular requisite for earning a livelihood, were to peruse and ponder over the moral contained in the highly-interesting narrative before us.

The author, a lad of about twenty, and an emigrant to South Australia, leaves a colony where steady and persevering industry might have ultimately secured him a competence, to realise within a few months, in California, unheard-of wealth, to be had for the mere stooping to pick it up. He reaches in safety the "golden gate," as the entrance to the harbour of San Francisco is called. How auspicious were the sights that greeted him may be inferred from the following:—

> Skirting the beach was a vast collection of tents, called the "Happy Valley"—since more truly designated the "Sickly Valley;" where filth of every description, and stagnant pools, beset one at every stride. In the tents congregated the refuse of all nations, crowded together; eight people occupying what was only space for two. Blankets, fire-arms, and cooking utensils were the only worldly property they possessed. Scenes of depravity, sickness and wretchedness shocked the moral sense, as much as filth and effluvia did the nerves; and such was the state of personal insecurity, that few "citizens" slept without fire-arms at hand.
>
> The constant wearing of arms by such a disorderly set,