

and guided by the love of an ethical idea, viz., religion. Undoubtedly your gutter child may be converted by mere intellectual drill into the 'subtlest of all the beasts in the field,' but we know what has become of the original of that description and there is no need to increase the number." The necessity of religious truth to effective moral teaching would be admitted by some, not by all, of the advocates of a purely secular system of public education. It would be more or less fully admitted by most of them who are professedly Christian men. But the ground is taken that while the knowledge of religious truth is desirable, it is best, especially in the divided state of opinion on religious questions, that religious instruction should be communicated by the parent and by the church, and that the school should confine itself to instruction in the secular branches. This is plausible; it is no more. I believe the position to be essentially unsound. For, first, if moral teaching, enforced by religious considerations, is requisite in order to make good, law-abiding citizens—that is, in order to promote the security and the well-being of society, the State ought to be able itself to furnish it, and ought to furnish it in the schools which it maintains. It is not denied for a moment that there is a kind and amount of religious instruction which is more competent to the parent and to the church, that there are aspects of religious truth, as for example, the nature and the necessity of regeneration, the work of the Holy Spirit, with which perhaps these alone should be expected to deal, but the more general truths of religion, as the existence, the character and the moral government of God—such truths as we have seen add to the sanctions of virtue and strengthen the sense of duty—these it must be competent for the State to teach, otherwise it does not possess the means for its own pro-

servation and for the protection of its own well-being. Second, the restriction of the school to purely secular instruction with the relegation of religious instruction and even moral on its religious side, to the home and the church gives no security that the latter will be supplied at all in many cases. There are not a few parents, even in our favoured land, who are too indifferent to impart moral and religious teaching to their children; not a few whose own character and habits render them quite incapable of effectively doing so. And while the churches—Protestant and Catholic—are active, there are no doubt many children and young persons not found in attendance on the Sabbath Schools with which they have dotted the surface of our vast country. The scattered nature of the settlements renders attendance in these more difficult, and, in any case, the churches have no authority to enforce it, if the youth are indifferent or indisposed. Make public education strictly secular, and it can scarcely fail to happen that in cases not a few the youth of the province will get their arithmetic and grammar from the school, their morals from the street corner or the saloon. That is not a result which any thoughtful and patriotic citizen can contemplate with satisfaction.

And lastly on this point, the division of instruction into secular and sacred, with the relegation of the one to the public school and of the other to the home and the Church, which is the ideal of some who should know better, proceeds upon a radical misapprehension of the constitution of man's being, in which the intellectual and moral nature are inseparably intertwined, and in which both parts are constantly operative. It ignores the fact that man is a single and indivisible entity. It is possible to divide the branches of knowledge, but it is not possible to divide the child to