

public employment, tested; but should not undertake to provide education for the nation." However correct this theory may be on abstract principles, we know from the experiment going on in England since the Reformation that such a way of dealing with education will leave great masses of the people untaught.

2. It is held by others, and this is the position of the church of Rome and some Protestant churches, that the State should educate the people through and by the church; that the money set apart for education should be divided according to population among the various denominations, and that each denomination should provide secular and *sectarian* education, hand in hand, for each child in its communion. This theory is utterly untenable, especially for a country like ours; because, *first*, it saddles the church with a work—secular instruction—that does not properly belong to its sphere of duty; *further*, it would unnecessarily multiply schools, and thus fritter away the nation's money on isolated efforts; *then* it would increase denominational jealousy, and widen the gulf, yearly becoming narrower, which separates the churches of Christ from each other; and, *last of all*, it is, in truth, nothing else than a State endowment of religion, in its worst form, without discriminating between truth and error. Against this theory the United States are now fighting; but our Dominion, through the exigencies of party politics, and the power of Rome, has already yielded the point, and granted to the church of Rome this theory of education, which is subversive of truth and fair-dealing towards other churches, and false to the great principle of a Free Church in a Free State, which is the only key that can unlock the door of peace and progress to Christian nations and churches.

8. There is a third party, that holds

that the State should educate, but that its education should be out and out *secular*, without any acknowledgment of anything higher than the three B's of the 'secularists' creed—Beer, Beef, and Bread. It is a remarkable fact, that though we hear so much about the beauties and advantages of this system, there is not, according to Dr. Rigg, to-day in the world a country that has fairly or fully adopted this system, though many are on the highway to it, save Holland, on which Roman Catholicism forced it some eighteen years ago, and perhaps also Chicago, on which the Materialists are now forcing the same system. Such a system of education, leaving out of account as it does the best half of the child, the moral faculties of the soul, is tolerable only on the principle that half-a-loaf is better than no bread, and would never have been heard of in Christendom but for the intense sectarianism of Romanism, and the bigotry of Infidelity.

#### WHY DOES THE STATE EDUCATE ?

Is there no other theory of national education save these three mentioned above? Is it possible for the State to justify against Mill and his followers a national system of education, and to find for itself, in this work, a just medium between sectarianism and secularism? This question can be answered only by considering the true relation in which the State stands to the education of the young, that is to say, by answering the question, *Why does the State educate?* We say here, at the outset of this important inquiry, that in dealing with education the State enters on ground that is well-nigh sacred. In dealing with our property, with revenue, with taxes, the State deals "with trash" (as Shakespeare terms one's purse, in contrast with his character) in comparison with the souls, the intellects, and the hearts of the young. When