

him, a part of the Church of England, and a few State Churchmen among the Presbyterians." If so, where is his overwhelming majority? We may safely say that by far the larger part of the Church of England, and I believe the larger part of the Presbyterians, such as were brought up in Established Church and Free Church principles, are against him. If polled to-day I believe that five out of every seven enlightened Protestants in the Dominion would vote for a daily Bible lesson in the Public schools.

But apart from numbers, I look for performance of what is right, of what is duty, of what is wisdom. Ten with truth and the Almighty are stronger than ten millions in the wrong.

Is it wrong for the State to own and honour God in her institutions? Can even a Deist say so? Shall a Christian say that the State has nothing to do with religion—that the servant has nothing to do with his master, the creature with the Creator? What is the State but the creation of God? What are rulers from the highest to the lowest but servants of Jesus Christ the King of all the kings of earth? What mean these words, "Be instructed, ye judges of the earth, serve the Lord with fear, kiss the son lest he be angry." "These mine enemies that would not have me to reign over them bring hither and slay them before me." Antipathy to State Churches has led good men to wild extremes. I do not advocate the State endowment of any Church in these days; but I do advocate the honour of our enthroned King by the civil servants who hold office under Him, *in their official capacity*, in every way consistent with their civil position. The time will come when kings, as such, will be nursing-fathers to the Church—that is, the civil heads in all lands will count it their highest duty to acknowledge the Lord in all

their work, and act on the high and noble principle applicable to all—"Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all to the glory of God."

But I call attention to another point of vital importance. The State has undertaken a great task; it has come into the room of the parent, in a very important department of duty—instruction and training, where the parent has not sufficient time or capacity. The State cannot do everything for the parent. It does not profess to do so. But it does profess to do certain things of essential value. What are these? Dr. Bryce says that the "aim of the Public schools" is to produce subjects "reliable, patriotic and intelligent." These are the three terms selected. Intelligent and patriotic we can understand, but what is meant by "reliable." Can a man be reliable who is not honest, sober, industrious, truthful, pure, merciful as opposed to cruel, and possessed of the fear of God where the eye of man is not on him. And how is this moral character to be formed without a standard of morality? Shall the Bible be referred to as condemning lies, and theft, and impurity, and violence and yet be excluded from the school? Shall there be any reference to an invisible, just and holy God and yet His Word be excluded and not a page of it read by teacher or scholars? Where is wisdom, when the beginning of it, the fear of God, is not inculcated? Do I hear the reply, All this is very well at home, in the Sabbath school and in the church, but the school is no place for it. Then how can the school train reliable citizens or subjects? Would it not be well to revise and modify in a new country theories that had their origin in circumstances widely different, where the State favoured some and not others, it may be equally deserving in many respects? What