

of modern times in relation to labour and capital, strikes and trades unions, and the invasion of the Chinaman—we shall purify our homes and the moral atmosphere of the land by banishing physical incapacity, indolence and mock-gentility and all the immoral amusements and other means now employed by multitudes to displace honest toil and kill time, and we shall convince such that downright hard work is at once respectable, delightful, and useful.

So much for the grand factor of physical culture and the manner in which ethical principles fit into it. Now for another point.

(c) *The culture of our mental powers.* In this connection I have time only to indicate two vital points without extended elaboration. *First*—I wish to protest, however briefly, against the growing feeling that having trained our *sensor* and *motor* organs—our physical nature—we have done all that is needed. On the contrary, I allege that we are not wholly animal in origin and constitution—that we are not all body—that the phenomena with which education is concerned are largely and chiefly spiritual. The evidence of this is incontrovertible. There are fundamental facts of our nature which cannot be accounted for on the supposition that we are all body and nothing more, and hence this hypothesis is untenable. We cannot, for example, account for the *indestructible feeling of unity* which is inseparable from the consciousness of personality. Such unity in no sense belongs to matter, for we know that by the application of sufficient force, in the form of heat, for instance, the particles of matter can be rent asunder, or different bodies may be fused into one. But such disintegration or fusion of the soul—the ego—is unthinkable. Consciousness rebels against it.

We cannot account for *personal identity* from the physical side of our nature or body-wise. Thus, we know that we are related daily to an infinite variety of subjective phenomena. We hope, we fear, we love, we hate, we enter into elaborate mathematical calculations and far-reaching processes of discursive thought. We change our relations to the whole universe every moment. Our views, opinions, and convictions change—our bodies change from infancy to old age, but *we* are the same—the conscious ego is identical from first to last. This is not a property of our animal nature, but of the spirit that is in man.

We cannot account for *will force* on the materialistic theory. This is thoroughly unlike anything found within the whole domain of *physical force*. Physical forces act with unvarying and unchangeable regularity. They move in ruts out of which they cannot lift themselves. But here is a force of infinite versatility—capable of acting in all directions—capable of opposing, directing, and overmastering physical forces—enough, were there nothing more revealed by consciousness, to save us from the folly of denying the existence of spirit.

And surely it is self-evident that the *properties of spirit and matter are not identical*. Thought, feeling, volition, moral sensibilities—these are properties of mind, but they cannot be aggregated into size, and weight, and colour—properties of matter. Our consciousness—the veracity of which we dare not question—in every indivisible act separates self from not-self. So sings the Poet Laureate:

"The baby, new to earth and sky,
What time his tender palm is pressed
Against the circle of his breast,
Has never thought that this is I.

"But as he grows he gathers much,
And learns the use of I and me,
And finds I am not what I see,
And other than the things I touch.

"So rounds he to a separate mind,
From whence clear memory may begin,
And thro' the frame that holds him in
His isolation grows defined."

We thus make sure of the two factors of our being—self and not-

self; and we do so in the interests of moral science, whose very basis is cut away if we fail to distinguish between body and mind.

Second—I wish in connection with the culture of our mental faculties to emphasize the need of preserving the proper balance of harmony among them—their regular or evenly development. This is not always attended to. There is an unreasonable pressure often laid upon the memory, for example—it is loaded and urged on like a beast of burden, to the neglect and injury of other faculties; or the imagination and feelings are so stimulated as to overpower the conscience and the will. In either case injury is done. The vice of cramming is encouraged; and this is an evil which deserves the strongest reprobation, because it perverts and distorts the child's powers, inflates him with a foolish conceit should he prove successful, or disgusts him with study in case of failure, and often saps the very foundations of health, and, what is worse, of morals, by the practical dishonesty which it fosters. Experienced teachers understand how all this happens. We all know how the body suffers—what weakness and unutterable agonies it passes through by having several sorts of indigestible food crammed into the stomach; and this is only a feeble type, a shadow, of the irreparable mischief done to the mind by persistent cramming. It is aside from my purpose to indicate the forms in which this vice is active, and the extent to which it frustrates the work of schools and college; but I may say in passing that as things are, pretty strong temptations present themselves to yield to its power. The haste to be rich, and hence the feverish wish of parents and senior pupils to abbreviate the period of school attendance and to enter business—the haste to rush and crowd into the learned professions—our pompous courses of study with thousands of pages in several languages to be read, a multitude of subjects to be mastered and academic degrees and honours to be gained all in five or six years—the fact that public sentiment offers a sort of premium in the form of special laudations to institutions which turn out in the shortest time the greatest amount of work thus done to order—all these things are so many potent temptations to indulge in cramming, to set aside the true philosophy of education and to ignore the symmetrical development of the senses, the physical frame and the mental powers upon which I insist.

(d) *The culture of our moral nature.* A few sentences on this point will complete my brief outline of what is to be aimed at by the educator. It may be granted without discussion that there is an immutable and eternal distinction between right and wrong; that the basis or standard of right is to be found, not in the feeling of self-love, the sense of utility, the impulse of benevolence, or in any of the changing phenomena of the human mind, but only in the divine nature—and that nature revealed in the record of creation and the written word.

It may be further conceded that there is an innate faculty or power in man which recognizes the distinction between right and wrong and discerns the moral quality of actions. This is the precise function of conscience. As a recent writer expresses it: "Conscience is the innate moral sensorium of the personality for differentiating right and wrong, good and evil." Furthermore, all creatures endowed with the faculty of moral discernment are, by the very condition of their being, under law to the Creator as their Moral Governor; it is inconceivable that creatures should be brought into existence under any condition than that of loving subjection to the Creator; and they are also related to one another by an infinite variety of moral obligations in the great fabric of society, and capable of forming an indefinite number of moral habits, both vicious and virtuous.

Now then, without extending these statements, or anticipating what is to be advanced in another connection, enough has been said to make it apparent that a fair treatment of man's nature, an