

the moral well-being of the children)? Will your chief reliance be on the morning prayer, the Scripture reading, and the prescribed exposition of a distinctive Christian morality? Or will it be on your own example and influence, your own interest in justice and every form of right-doing, your own strong disapproval of whatever is wrong, of whatever tends to the deterioration of character?"

If I am wrong in thinking that Mr. Le Sueur holds that there should be no religious element in the education given in Public Schools, I shall be glad if he will state what amount of reference to religion in any form he would think proper on the part of teachers. If I am right, then I take issue with Mr. Le Sueur and assert that there ought to be a religious element in the instruction imparted in our Public Schools. I do not say that no good moral results can be secured apart from distinct religious teaching; but the best moral results cannot be attained without the distinct recognition of the living God, in Whom we live and move and have our being, without Whom not a sparrow shall fall to the ground, in Whose sight children are of more value than many sparrows, Who loves righteousness and hates wickedness in child or man, Who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life, Who with His Son freely gives us all things, Who hears the cry of the weak and the sad and the sinful, Who blesses those that trust in Him, before Whom the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, in Whose House the good of all the ages shall be gathered, to be "for ever with the Lord." I am prepared to maintain that the teacher who ignores such truths as these, and declines to use the mighty leverage which they furnish in the moral training of children,

substituting for it simply his "own interest in justice and every form of right-doing," makes a grievous mistake. There is no question about the importance of the teacher's personal influence. Better, I would say, an earnest-minded teacher of blameless life who declines to say anything to his pupils about God, than a man who inculcates all the teachings of the Bible and yet is himself immoral. But why put asunder what God has joined together—a true faith in Himself and a good life springing from it as a root? And if the life of the teacher is fed daily from a divine Source, can he do better than lead his pupils to drink at the same Fountain? And if the great majority of parents in Ontario are of opinion that the best results cannot be secured for their children by daily teaching that ignores God, is there any injustice to the unbelieving minority in the requirement that the teaching given in the Public Schools should include the religious element?

This is really the main question which Mr. Le Sueur raises. He insists that "all creeds, positive and negative, stand on an equality before the law," and that this principle of "religious liberty," or "religious equality," is violated if teachers are required to give religious instruction. Now, let us suppose a case. Here is a community consisting of fifty families, in forty-eight of which the parents believe that the best moral results in the education of their children cannot be secured apart from religious instruction, while in the other two the parents do not believe in God and do not wish to have any religious element in the training of their children. In regard to all other branches of study, these parents are agreed that it is best to have their children taught together. This arrangement is made especially in the interest of the two families which cannot by themselves