

dren find that plan inconvenient? Far too much tape is round the door of entrance to the High School.

As an illustration of what we said last month on the teaching of morality in school, we make an extract from an extremist on the war-path, who evidently has as poor an idea of what the true function of the Common School is as many more moderate-minded people have. At a meeting of the Schoolmasters' Association in New York lately its President, while asking whether the State should teach morals in school or not, he said that one of the fundamental principles of American institutions was the complete separation of Church and State, and he believed that the history of other countries afforded full justification of that principle. Liberty has always been endangered by a too powerful Church attempting to regulate religious opinion. He said that the founders of the republic were right when they made no mention of the Deity in the constitution. The fathers were not trying to frame a theology, but to found a State. But, because there is no God in the constitution, one has no right to call the Government "a godless government." As well call this club "godless," because there is no religious clause in its constitution, or a business firm "godless" because it does not mention God in its contracts. Business is one thing, the State is another, and religion is distinct from both. "I think," said Dr. Taylor, "that we ought to get enough warnings from history to prevent us from coquetting with the effort to bring Church and State together. I am not going to say that the Bible should not be read in the Public Schools, nor that the schools should not be opened with prayer. I have no objections to such exercises. But the State has no right to enforce such regulations among people who do not wish to have their

children attend religious exercises in the Public Schools. The schools are founded to teach good citizenship. So far as ethical teaching may involve the teachings of religion, the State has no right to insist upon it."

It is almost a pity to quote the above. Dr. Taylor tells us that "business is one thing, the State is another, and religion is distinct from both." But he does not tell us what the Common School is, whereas it is the Common School and its function that he has under discussion. Does he really know what the function of the Common School is? The agricultural philanthropist says it is for the teaching of agriculture, the best way of making butter and cheese, or of supervising a kitchen garden. The *religieuse* says it is for the propagation of the true religion and the making of possible saints, while the politician declares, with Dr. Taylor, that it has only to do with the making of good citizens. And yet, his conjuring with the words "godless" and "not godless" passes current, and his address is declared to have been the address of the evening. Neither the agricultural philanthropist, nor the *religieuse*, nor the civic-spouter knows what he is talking about; and yet, if any of them or all of them were once to consider the nature of "a little child set down in their midst," and examine the possibilities and activities within that nature, they would ever after be ashamed of having insulted nature in the paroxysm of their own confirmed ignorance. The motherliness of nature and her task to be performed under the supervision of one of her true handmaidens, the teachers of the land, they have never understood, nor, we believe, are capable of comprehending.

The pleading for a closer touch with Nature comes from a true teacher like a prayer to us all. Who, like