

instruction in morals is useless or misleading unless accompanied by instruction in religion. Very much can be done in teaching good conduct without teaching religious doctrine. Much has been done, and much can be done again, and in a case so urgent it surely is our duty to reject nothing that can help us. It is quite possible for us to be like my neighbour who kept his children in a house without a fire while winter was coming on, because the stove that some one offered him for almost nothing was not as large as he desired.

There is some danger, indeed, that Christian lands may be put to shame in this very way. While we are declining to teach morals where we cannot teach religion, others are finding instruction in morals indispensable, and are giving it. The schools of France fell out of the hands of the Roman Catholic Church a few years ago, and into the hands of men who had small care for religion. Some of them were atheists. But they immediately said that the nation must not let moral instruction lapse with the removal of ecclesiastical power, and proceeded to provide text-books on personal, social and civic duty. Such books are in use in the schools of France. How good they are I do not know; but I do know that in this land text-books of morality could be prepared by the aid of which the young would come up to life with some definite knowledge, where now there is ignorance or only the vaguest thought. And if some practical help can be brought near to those who are growing up in a world so full of vice, surely it is not optional to give the help or to withhold it. It must be given.

A third necessity in order to the improvement of moral culture, as I believe, is *industrial education* in the public schools. I am aware that on

this point some will differ with me, but I confidently expect that no very long time will have passed before the difference is left behind.

Here again we should remember that public education is intended to fit the pupils in some good measure for the life that is before them. And it should be added that labour, daily labour, is to be the lifelong lot of the great majority of those who attend the public schools. Since this is true, it follows that the training that they receive in school should be such as to prepare them, in some way, for a life of labour. If our schools set themselves to the training of a leisured class, they will not only defeat their own true object, but become a curse to the country.

Here we meet another danger from the tendency, inherent in a school system, to over-intellectualizing—the danger of educating children away from their life. Of course it is most desirable that some children should be educated away from the life to which they seem to have been born. It is one glory of the public schools that they help to draw the select few out from among the many to a more intellectual life than the many can live. But it is easy besides for the school to create in the many such tastes and habits as will disqualify them for the life that is before them. Children from the families of labouring men are brought under public education. They come under influences that stimulate the taste for intellectual activity. They are taught that to think, to learn, to know, are the great things. They are fascinated with the idea. They do not learn enough to be very wise, but they do learn enough to think that intellectual pursuits are essentially higher than labour. Conceit of knowledge is easier to get than knowledge, and always comes earlier. When their life in school is ended, intellectual habits have been crudely