

text-book to the exclusion of the method of free investigation. This has been, too, the method of the parochial schools of Catholics, and, in fact, of all religious denominations.

The dogmatic authoritative method is the only method in which religion can be taught properly. This should be well understood. The utmost care should be taken to surround religious instruction with the proper atmosphere. It should be approached through solemn appropriate exercises such as the Church has established in its ceremonial. The time and place should assist the religious impression. In the secular school the religious impression is weakened or dissipated by the environments.

If the pupil leaves the secular school and repairs to the Church to receive a religious lesson, the impression made upon him is much stronger than the same lesson given in the secular school in connection with secular lessons. Careful observers of the effects of the religious lessons placed on programmes of schools in Germany and Austria and other nations tell us that where the secular studies are taught according to the true method the pupils are prone to hold in a sort of contempt the contents of their religious lessons. They are apt to bring their critical intellects to bear on dogmas and become sceptical of religious truth altogether. It is well known that the people of Germany are much given to scepticism. Its educated class is famous for its "free-thinking," so-called. The French educated class, all of which was in its youth under parochial school influences, is atheistic.

All Protestant nations are agreed that there should be a separation of Church and State. The Catholic laity all over the world is nearly unanimous in the same opinion. I think that even the Catholic priesthood, at least in the United States,

holds this view. The separation of the Church and State implies the separation of the Church and school. The Church and State are separated in the interest of the perfection of both. The Church regards the disposition of the individual man considering it in respect to sin and holiness. The State regards the individual man in respect to his overt act whether law-abiding or criminal. Crime is a matter of overt act. Sin is a matter of disposition—of thought and feeling, as well as of volition. If the State goes behind the overt act and punishes the disposition of the individual, civil government will be destroyed. If, on the other hand, the Church considers the overt act instead of the disposition of the soul religion will cease. Crime can be measured, the deed can be returned on the individual; but sin cannot be measured, its consequences can be escaped only by repentance. Sin is infinite and no finite punishment can wash it away; but repentance without punishment will do this just as well as repentance with punishment. The exercise of ecclesiastical power by the State tends to confuse its standards of punishment and to make its penalties too severe at one time and too lax at another, and thus to render the whole course of justice uncertain by considering the disposition of the criminal rather than his overt act. Religious persecutions have arisen by the State assuming ecclesiastical functions, and the Church has had to bear the obloquy of them.

On the other hand, the exercise of civil power on the part of the Church tends to introduce finite standards, thus allowing expiation for sin and permitting the substitution of penance for repentance. This makes the expiation of sin an external matter. The Government acting on an ecclesiastical basis would say to the criminal: You have committed murder. Well,