

and should have no doctrine of God to promulgate nor form of worship to be observed. Hence state schools should use no book of religion, but should confine the instructions given to subjects concerning which citizens of all religions, or of no religion, are agreed. This bold statement contains the gist of the theoretic objection. Ultimately it will be found to rest on assumptions, viz. : that (1) Because education is a national good, therefore the nation should educate; and that in such manner as the state sees fit. (2) The will of the nation (*i. e.* of the majority) is law for each individual citizen, and no Higher Law can be admitted. (3) The child is to be dealt with by the state directly, and not through the parent. (4) Education may be religious or otherwise as the state determines. (5) Science and philosophy may be taught, although faith in Revelation is thereby imperilled; but Revealed Truth should not be taught. In antagonism to the above we contend that (1) Education of body, intellect and spirit, is the right of every child. (2) To provide this education is primarily the duty of the parent, just as to feed and clothe the child are. (3) The state should take care that this is done by the parent, so far as it is a state necessity. (4) When the parent neglects or cannot perform this duty the state should do it for him, or aid him in doing it, just as it cares for feeding and clothing orphans and waifs. (5) The Higher Law of God is binding on the parent in the education of his child; and the state has no right to interfere or to deprive the parent or child of their God-given privilege. (6) The child ought to be dealt with by the state only in and through the parent.

Between these theories there is a fundamental and irreconcilable antagonism. And unless common ground be found in *practice*, the Christian community must withdraw, as they

cannot support schools based on purely naturalistic and agnostic principles. Such ground has been found in time past, and unless it is abandoned the nation as a whole can still support schools on a basis more satisfactory than is the theory we oppose.

It may further here be in place to protest strenuously against the *dictum* "The state, as such, has no religion and should know no religion." That dictum is not more opposed to Christian sentiment than contradictory to historical facts. In the long past what nation had not its gods, its priests, and its religion? In the present day where is there a nation without its God and its religion? A particular *cultus* is as much an essential characteristic of a nation as ethnic descent or language. Even in the United States of America, whatever may be the theory of the constitutions of the several states and of the Federal Union, we find practically a Christian Protestant nation. So far these states have resisted all the demands of Popery on the one hand and of Infidelity on the other, which are inconsistent with the revealed law of God. And beyond all question, in Great Britain and its Colonies, the Bible is recognised as possessed of authority, churches are more or less fully acknowledged and privileged, and in state schools the Roman Catholic religion as well as Protestant books are taught. This theory then fails in its application among us in Canada, as it is opposed to Christian feeling and historic fact.

The second objection, as has been said, is practical, viz. : The jealousies and rivalries among Protestant denominations render any religious instruction in schools impracticable. Were this true, we would only say the more the shame and pity, and a remedy must be found by individual denominations in the establishment of denominational schools. This would