

unalterable standard of right ; that to do his will is the highest and best qualification for citizenship.

Hence the legitimate conclusion, that the Word of God is the highest authority to which to look for a knowledge of truth, righteousness, justice, love of neighbor and loyalty to rulers.

If these conclusions are fairly reached, the next question to be asked is how shall moral instruction be introduced and be made a part of school work? But before attempting an answer, it is only wise to look fairly and squarely at the difficulties that must be overcome.

First, we have the unworthy jealousies of sectarians to which broadminded and Christian men find themselves face to face whenever they argue and agitate for moral instruction in the public schools, and which charges them with hostility to the system.

Then we have too many of the secular, selfish spirit who seek only material and present success, ignoring the best interests of their children and their country. If these are left alone to advance their worldly interests they will in turn let alone our educational machinery, however imperfect. Even the intellectual education of their children will be neglected, as is clearly shown in the fact that the average attendance at our rural schools is only one day in two ; and in all schools, urban and rural, only 56 out of 100.

We have also a class of high standing, educationally and morally, who object to formal moral education in the school because it savors of State-church and denominationalism. Some of these assert boldly that it is not the place of the State to teach religion. True, but to teach the fundamental principles of ethics is not to teach the religions of the churches. It surely means the teaching of the

underlying principles accepted by all the churches. And if moral character is essential to the safety, permanency and progress of free institutions, then, for self-preservation, the State must insist upon the adequate moral training of the young.

Fortunately we have few, if any, Socialists or Communists amongst us and consideration of their special attitude is not really needed. Practically, they are Ishmaelites ; and society should know how to deal with the enemies of law and order, of prosperity and progress.

There is further difficulty in the question of what is to be taught under the heading of morals or ethics ; and of course as to how it is to be taught. Some claim that it is only to be taught incidentally, inferentially and implicitly. Others, of course, claim that there must be a syllabus and definite time for this work just as for other studies.

Then too the question is asked, who shall teach morals? The teacher or some one else? And shall time be taken out of the regular school hours for this purpose?

If these difficulties are approached as they should be in a patriotic and liberal spirit, they may all be overcome. They are no more formidable than were those to be overcome in England, where "for twenty-three years the subject (of religious instruction) had been settled upon the peaceable basis of compromise ; in practice its theoretical differences and perplexities have been obviated or solved ; and in point of fact the so-called 'religious difficulty' has ceased to exist." (Memorial from the National Union of Elementary teachers, 1893). The memorialists proceed to say "they venture to think that none can speak with more experience of the facts than the teachers themselves ; and the teachers are aware that the instruction has been