

jecting morality; and it may be remembered that when Herbert Spencer was in this country, he declared that knowledge alone could not be relied on to secure the purification of politics. That "it is essentially a question of character, and only in a secondary way a question of knowledge. Not a lack of information, but lack of certain moral sentiments, is the root of the evil." But surely we do not need the authority of great names to assure us that the honest labourer who can neither read nor write, but who has the sense of duty in his heart, is a better citizen than the accomplished scholar who has blunted his conscience and sharpened his wits, so that he can swindle his fellows out of a fortune.

I may be told that, however necessary moral teaching may be, it is the duty of the home, and that the school may be excused from it. But I reply that, if the state owes each child it assumes to educate a moral, as well as a mental, training, it cannot rightfully rely on the performance of this duty by others; that the children who come from the worst homes, where no such instruction is thought of, need it most; that even in homes where it is theoretically valued, business, cares, or pleasures practically shut it out; and, besides all this, while I would not underestimate either the absolute or the relative worth of home teaching, the teaching of the school supplements the best work of parents, with advantages of its own.

Can we teach ethics without religion? Probably. I say probably, because there is not much experimental proof. We hear more than we see of that kind of teaching. But we cannot teach with authority, we cannot teach with impressiveness, without thought of Him who is the Absolute Right. The peculiarity of Christianity itself is not in the revela-

tion of new ethical truth, but in bringing to us that new sense of God, and of our relation to Him, which makes the idea of duty regnant in the heart. Matthew Arnold very inadequately defines religion as "morality touched with emotion." But although it is much more, it is that; and without religion morality has neither emotion nor motion. It will stay in the text-book.

And so, coming to the heart of the problem, I say that I would have religion taught as a part of our public education. What religion? 'The only religion that is a part of the common law, the only religion that permeates our literature, and the religion that is related to all our modern civilization—Christianity. But it should be the Christianity of Christ, not that of sects; the Christianity which, in its practical aspects, is fitted to be the universal religion of mankind; which appeals as did the Master, for its test to the common judgment of what is right.

Can the public school teach such a common Christianity? It were indeed a scandal to our religion if there were no ground upon which its nominal adherents could stand together. Can it be that our schools must be left pagan because we are sectarian? Such a conclusion is repulsive to the common sense of the community. All the tendencies of the age are toward breadth and unity. I think there are but very few who call themselves Christians who would prefer that our schools should be godless rather than that they should confine themselves to the Lord's prayer as their liturgy, the Two Great Commandments as the rule of holy living, and the doctrines of the Sermon on the Mount as the inspiration and comfort of the soul. I would have the state, then, in this spirit, undertake the work of religious training in three ways.

First. Let the sentiment of worship.