

selves on freedom of thought. I should grant the fullest latitude in opinion. I should allow everyone who wishes to believe that Christ was only a greater Socrates or Confucius, and that the study of "protoplasms" will shew that religion is only another name for superstition, to hold, though at his own peril, to those opinions. Christianity has too much "good will to all men" to sanction any other attitude, and if true, fears not, but rather encourages, investigation. Why hinder the so-called moral man who is a sceptic in religion from entering the profession of the teacher? The question is easily met. Our school system is a compromise made by the parent with the State. The parent who believes in Christianity is responsible for the religious training of his child, and he simply delegates a portion of his duty to the teacher who as an officer performs his work in harmony with the compact entered into with the State. The teacher is bound to discharge his duties in accordance with the terms of the agreement. The nature of the agreement must be observed by the teacher; its modification, if desirable, pertains to the politician. I have little fear any greater laxity will be advocated in this direction. As soon as our school law recognizes that morality is not based on Christianity, our national system is doomed. Such a revolution in public sentiment may be regarded as a most unlikely occurrence. Should it happen, we might necessarily and properly adopt a denominational system. It may be asked, why cannot the teacher perform his duties without being obliged to indicate, in his relations to his pupils, his opinions upon principles of morality or religious convictions? Simply because no one can do what is impossible. To give colourless teaching is, I contend, what cannot be done. No one would allow that the teacher should appear to be what

he is not. Christianity admits no neutral position. He that is not *for* is *against* Christ and his followers. The man who cultivates the intellect must call into play and train the moral faculty as well. The scholar is not, like a dial-plate, the passive recipient of external impressions. The teacher cannot hide his moral nature and bring into action his intellectual power. When the mental faculties have been aroused he must possess a logical power of analysis more acute than that of the most skilful teacher who can develop the intellectual and let the moral lie dormant. From every figure on the blackboard, from every line and name on the map, from every verse of Homer, and from every re-action in chemical science, the inquiring boy may be brought to push his investigations downward to conscience and upward to God. How can I teach anatomy without giving a bias in favour of, or in opposition to, materialism? How can I teach history, and display the charts which its pages unfold, without tracing effects to causes and attributing more or less to divine omniscience? If I teach mathematics, how easy to convince that experimental religion is all a delusion and revelation a myth, because they cannot be demonstrated like a principle in the Calculus or a proposition in Euclid. I must, however, impart tone and effect to my teaching. I may appear silent upon many great problems, but if I deal with matters upon which their minds become active, I cannot fail to leave my impressions. My voice may not be heard, still my opinions are grasped, if only from the "shrug of my shoulders, the wave of my hand, the curl of my lip, or the scornful flash of my eye." I must speak if I feel, and if I do not feel, I am no teacher. If I am so cold-blooded and passionless as not to be stirred by the things that form a