

does not know, what is good for the child. There is the stage of intelligent, but equal if not more implicit obedience, when parent and child alike know—for both reason—that happy social existence is impossible without a well-balanced and well defined relation between the two. Adult obedience to parental authority is possibly the finest trait in human character.

To lose sight of the notion of a family is, in my opinion, to miss the spirit of growth of Constitutional Government in England; to fail to appreciate the relation of the Crown, the Lords, and the Commons, the one to the other, and of the Church to all.

That man is not the author of his own being, has never been disputed; hence, in one sense at least, every thinking man has a religion, and consequently no community can be without one or more creeds.

Most admit that it is the duty of the parent not merely to maintain and defend his non-self-supporting children, but to train them and teach them, among other matters, the Divine will, *i. e.*, the Divine will as it has been revealed, or at least as understood, by him; that it is his duty to take them when young to the church of his choice; to suffer them, when of riper years, to go to the church of their own choice. In like manner, in most states, whether ancient or modern, there has been and is a national church to which, during the infancy of the nation, all were compelled to go; but as to which, at a later date, they have been left more or less free. As constitutional lawyers we have nothing to do with religious creeds or practices, save those of the national church and our own, should they happen not to be those of the national church; but we have much to do with the creeds and practices of the national church, whether it is the church of our choice or not, for re-

ligion has been and can be made an engine of social ill. As British subjects, we say that it is the duty of the sovereign power in England to make religious persecution impossible, and that that can only be done by granting and securing full liberty of conscience; that it is the duty of the sovereign power to secure, if possible, due respect for religion, and that history has taught us that that can best be done by attaching one form of religion to the State in order that, by being attached, religion in some form may have dignity, and by being controlled by the State it may be kept from extremes—Fetishism on the one hand, and vulgar familiarity with God and things divine on the other.

Our forefathers found by experience that Romanism was objectionable as a state religion, for independently of creed the Roman clergy professed allegiance to a foreign potentate, and thus subverted the very foundation of national sovereignty, and, by enforcing celibacy on the clergy, rendered it difficult for them to have interests in common with the people. Hence the substitution of the Anglican Church, which admits of no superior to the State but God, as being the author of all authority, and which permits and encourages its clergy to marry that their sympathies may be at one with those of the people.

I make allusion to the Church first that it may, as far as possible, be dismissed from the general question without the possibility of any supposing that as a part of the constitution its value is underrated. In my opinion the Crown, the Church, and the Lords are inseparable, and I feel that the glory of England could not endure without them.

No child is presumably indifferent as to his parentage. Those whose good fortune it is to have had parents of whom they may be justly proud