

saw a map of Palestine in their whole course used for instruction in any of these schools.

But we all, who have passed through our public institutions of learning from the Public school to the University, know how little attention is given to the study of the sacred places or of sacred history. We were compelled to know accurately the topography of Greece and Italy, but not of Palestine. We could draw a map of Athens or Rome, and locate the important places, but not of Jerusalem. We were compelled to know all about the Parthenon but not about the temple. We were told the laws of Lycurgus but not the laws of Moses. We must be able to tell about the gods and goddesses of Greece and fill our minds with stories of mythology of questionable morality, but little was said of the God of Israel, and the rich stories of the Bible were not asked for in any examination paper. We must be able to tell all about the agrarian laws of Rome, but not a syllable was taught us of the magnificent land laws of Israel.

We make these statements not as a railing accusation but in a spirit of deep grief.

Who is to blame for this state of things? Who is responsible? The home? the church? the school? These three keep shifting and shunting the responsibility about from one to the other.

"The prime responsibility rests with the parents." A man rises and expresses himself very sententiously thus, and then sits down with an air of satisfaction as if the whole matter were settled. But the question comes, how is the parent to discharge this responsibility? By what instrumentality?

Stress in our country is laid upon the Sunday-school. We think that

both the parents and the Public school are seeking to shunt the greater part of the duty upon the Sunday-school teacher.

It is marvellous what is accomplished in the Sunday-school considering its opportunity. But it becomes evident on the least examination that the Sunday-school cannot overtake the great work of religious education.

The amount of teaching that can be done in the Sunday-school is very limited at the best.

The preparation of the lessons is utterly defective. The very pupils who are compelled to bring lessons well prepared to the Public school will come to Sunday-school without having read the lesson over.

The co-operation of parents with the Sunday-school is often limited to a recitation of the Golden Text, if it even goes so far.

The appliances for teaching are often not up-to-date.

The expectation from the Sunday-school is out of all proportion to time and appliances at its disposal.

Sometimes I feel drawn to the conclusion that it would be well if Sunday-schools were abolished, for parents would then wake up to the real situation.

The responsibility rests upon the parents. They can discharge that responsibility by being more faithful in their teaching at home, they can encourage and co-operate heartily with the Sunday school, but in my judgment there is only one way in which the parents can thoroughly discharge this responsibility and secure efficient religious instruction for their children, and that is by insisting that it shall form part of the regular curriculum of the Public school.

They build the schools, they buy the appliances, they pay the teachers—What for? In this way