

such as Christian theologians could collectively endorse. They know that the scholars have been carefully and reverently taught the essentials of the Christian faith as drawn from the Holy Scriptures."

Here we have more than mere theory. We have the "Settlement of 1870," a wise and statesmanlike compromise between the two great parliamentary parties, and we have the outgrowth of its provisions for religious instruction. We find that only 91 School Boards out of a total of 2,255 in England and Wales had failed to provide for religious exercises. "We find the London School Board elaborating a full Syllabus of Bible instruction, which is followed in all its schools and occupies from half to three quarters of an hour daily. We find "explicit directions issued to the teachers as to the carrying out of the scheme." In addition to the 450,000 children of London affected by this instruction, the influence of this scheme has been greatly extended by its adoption by 101 other boards, including several of the most important cities."

We are proud of our intimate relations with Great Britain, and proud of the inheritance we have received from her. Why should we hesitate to copy so practical and successful an example? Why should not the leaders of both parties in our legislature follow the example of British statesmen, and elaborate a workable scheme for the moral elevation of every child in Ontario? Why may we not have a commission, large and representative, to prepare, in harmony with the received principles of all denominations, an outline of truth that shall be hailed with pleasure by all right thinking people?

Having received ample scope and authority from our legislators, such a commission would acquaint itself with the special demands of Ontario as

contrasted with those of England, of Germany, or any other country having a course of such instruction. It would possess itself of the curriculum of each. It might discover textbooks such as that written by the Rev. J. O. Miller, of Ridley College, St. Catharines, and that published by J. A. Quay, Morgantown, Pa., which is in use in mixed schools in Pittsburgh and other towns in that State.

Such commission should have power to call before it educational experts and men of experience; and after the fullest investigation and deliberation, we should be provided with a scheme that should satisfy all reasonable men: and in a few years place our public school system on a par with the most liberal and advanced in moral training, as it is already in its literary course.

To discuss all the theories of educationists in reference to this subject, after pointing to a successful system, may seem unnecessary; yet it will not be out of place briefly to advert to some of these:

The broad question as to what are the limits of ethical or moral teaching in schools has never been settled. There are those, like Spencer and Adler, among modern writers, who claim and teach the humanitarian doctrine that the obligations which grow out of the relations of man to his fellowmen alone belong to morals. Alder says "ethics is a science of relations—of human interests and human ends." "Moral laws are formulas expressing relations of subordination, equality or superordination," etc. Bain and Johnnot, though admitting that the relations of man to his Maker may be considered in this connection, restrict themselves to discussing morals under the same limitations.

Spencer's dictum may be summarized in his own words, "that conduct whose total results, immediate