

will undertake to produce secularly well-educated children.

The principle asserts that the State has no business whatever to ask what religion is given by any such body or organization in addition to, or along with the secular instruction which alone is its concern. If it refuses to pay for that instruction, by whomsoever it may be provided, because the body so providing it does also teach religion, then the State is violating its neutrality and persecuting the Churches. Dr. Joseph Parker assumes that strict logic is on his side, and that if it be only uncompromisingly asserted men will come round to his conclusion. I hold that strict logic is against him, and I trust that a general revolt against his conclusion will lead to a wider and wider detection of the fallacies on which it rests. The dogma with which that conclusion is inseparably connected is—not the neutrality or indifference of the State towards all voluntary societies, but an inherent hostility on the part of the State to all such bodies if they have a religious character. Religion is to be regarded as something so unclean that the State will not even touch it with a barge-pole. Churches may produce scholars educated up to any standard of secular knowledge required by a State department, but they are not to get the money thus fairly earned, because they add to the secular information some elements of knowledge in Divine things. This is not neutrality. It is hostility, and even enmity. Such a policy is a complete abandonment, and indeed a complete defiance, of the principle on which it pretends to be founded.

But having repudiated Dr. Parker's conclusion, let me explain my own. Accepting the doctrine of the State being neutral in theology, but insisting that to be so, it must not be hostile to, or even jealous of, the Churches, its attitude towards them on the mat-

ter of education ought logically to be expressed in some such language as this: "We, the State, are so divided in religious belief that we are compelled to be neutral between you, the Churches. We, therefore, cannot help ourselves; we cannot give any definite or effective teaching of religion. But you can. And you can do what we cannot; you can combine the two, the secular and the religious element. We have no right and we have no wish to prevent you. We will, therefore, pay you for the only results of which we are competent to take any cognisance, and we will pay you at such rates as may be fairly proportionate to the cost."

Of course, I am not to be held as admitting, except for the sake of argument, that, secular as our society undoubtedly is in many respects, it is really quite so pagan as this language represents it to be. But what must be insisted upon is that the most complete and absolute secularisation of the State would not only leave it free to deal with education on the footing I have defined, but would absolutely demand of it a line of conduct in harmony with that definition. I hold that the attitude of the State ought to be one of at least benevolent neutrality towards agencies which do a work which it confesses itself unable to accomplish. It ought to do everything it can to encourage those agencies to help it in secular education, and it should rejoice in that education being associated with a still higher education from which it is compelled to withdraw its hand.

I do not forget that this solution is not complete. It would be complete if any, or all, of the Churches comprehended the whole people. But unfortunately they do not. Thousands, perhaps some millions, belong to no Church. For them I fear we must be satisfied with such compromises as that which now prevails in