

nocent child, in order that it may learn a lesson on the properties of heated bodies, be allowed to lay hold of the fire-bars, thrust its fingers into the candle flame, or spill boiling water on its skin? Must the school-boy, ignorant of the great necessity of study, be permitted to waste his time in idleness and folly, because in manhood he will certainly pay the penalty? Must the drunkard who impoverishes and maltreats his family, the thief who robs his neighbour, or the murderer who deprives his fellow-being of life be left unmolested to the pangs of their own guilty conscience? "Yes," says Mr. Spencer, "because not only have our artificial means of punishment failed to produce reformation, but they have in many cases increased criminality. If, Judas-like, our murderers would, after contemplating the wickedness of their actions, go and hang themselves, we might then be able to dispense with at least a portion of these punishments; but unfortunately those who can be guilty of such atrocious crimes are not troubled with over-delicate consciences, and therefore, for the sake of society and individual safety, "we had better endure those ills we have, than fly to others we know not of." This is Mr. Spencer's *guiding principle of morality*. This is the system of moral education, so beneficent in its efforts, and so admirably calculated to supply the wants of the first, last and intermediate divisions of life.

But we are told that it is particularly in the family that this golden rule works to best advantage, for there the child, suffering nothing more than the painful effects brought upon it by its own wrong actions, must recognize the justice of these natural penalties. The parental and filial relations will be more friendly, and therefore more influential. Children will be less disturbed in temper and parents may enjoy a state of comparative equanimity. Is this a moral training? Are parents justified in thus erecting a wall between themselves and those for whose conduct they must answer before the judgment-seat of their Creator?

Man's inhumanity to man may make countless thousands mourn, but parents' coldness and indifference to the conduct of their children, blight their future hopes and render artificial punishments a grave necessity. These are his ideas of moral

education, let us see whether his treatment of intellectual education is any better. At the outset, we meet with the usual bigotry and prejudice. "When men received their creed and its interpretations from an infallible authority deigning no explanations, when believe and ask no questions, was the maxim of the church, it was necessary that the teaching of the school should be purely dogmatic. But now that Protestantism has gained for adults the right of private judgment, and established the practice of appealing to reason, there is harmony in the change that has made juvenile instruction a process of exposition addressed to the understanding." Truly there was a time, and that time has not ceased to be, when men received their creed from an infallible authority, but there never went by a time, when that creed was received without explanations, when explanations were required or possible. Believe and ask no questions was and is to-day a maxim, when to question would be the sheerest folly.

What private judgment has done and is doing, towards facilitating and harmonizing the processes of education, may be seen in the rationalistic tendencies of our age, an age in which "human reason summons before the bar of its judgment not only the doings of men, but the revelations of God, although at no other time have the fundamental principles of reason been so constantly outraged." Its effects, too, are evident from the confusion, doubt and contention which exists at the present time and which is daily increasing among the various Protestant denominations. It is even still more manifest from the signal failure, notwithstanding their almost unlimited resources and vast expenditures, to evangelize pagan lands. And not only have their efforts in almost all cases been unproductive of good, but they have actually impeded by their want of unity, the true and only evangelizers, the priests of the Catholic Church. After all, private judgment with its natural consequence, rationalism, should not be the distinguishing characteristic of the Protestant church, were its members true to the principle laid down by their great founder three centuries ago. Luther was not in favor of private judgment as now understood, otherwise he should not have said to his followers,