

disappear, for prejudice dwells not with knowledge but with ignorance.

Then are the Jews who do not believe in the New Testament and those who may be called nullifidians, to be taxed to have their children taught error? Using the Bible as a reading-book just as we now read stories of heathen mythology and studying it as literature just as these are studied would do much to reconcile these objectors. With these, there is no doubt, that the prejudice engendered by viewing the Bible from an ecclesiastical standpoint rather than from that of life and literature, history and ethics has been and is the great drawback to the general use of the Bible in schools.

Then the fact that the Bible has been used in schools for years, e.g., in those of Germany, of Scotland, and in schools where religious teaching formed the staple subject taught, supply, it is feared, if not arguments against its use, at least no positive ones in its favor. Is it not a fact that unbelief is rife in Germany to-day, ask the opponents of the Bible in schools. Are the Scotch better citizens, better behaved, more moral, more temperate, than their fellow citizens of Ontario?

These allegations may be quite true. They simply establish the fact that the religious and moral tone of a school or people do not depend upon governmental regulations but rather upon the religious and moral influence exercised by the teacher as a living, dynamic force. Religion and morality cannot be taught directly like a lesson in arithmetic or grammar. They are absorbed from the child's environment, all unconsciously. A teacher can say to his class with perfect reason, "I am going to teach you fractions, or case, or the

counties of Ontario," but one who would say, "I am going to teach you to be kind, or truthful, or loving, or reverent," if not laughed at by his class, would at least be placing himself in the anomalous position of undertaking to do that which even the pupils know he has no power to do. The principles of religion and morality can be taught. These can and must be made the mental possession of the child, but whether they will pass into feeling and thus influence will and conduct depends upon the teacher, who must be the living embodiment of what he is attempting to teach, for school is influenced not only by what he does and says, but far more by what he is, by his tastes, his preferences, his bearing, his courtesy, the breadth of his sympathies, and the largeness and fullness of his life. These facts are constantly forgotten or ignored in practice. In spite of a uniform experience that character is formed and life shaped by personal influences far more than by formal didactic instruction, many assume that the catechism, the lesson leaf, the formal lesson, are the great factors in religious and moral training. How true is the Hebrew maxim: "The doctrine is not the principal thing, but the deed." It is only when the pupil is living in an atmosphere of truth, and purity, and reverence that he becomes these; only when the teacher, himself, feels the true character and force of every lesson, and watches over the moral and spiritual development of his pupils with the same solicitude as he watches their progress in scholarship; only then is he entitled to the term educator, and only then does elementary instruction become the portal to a liberal education. Hence the teacher must cultivate himself, must give full play to all that is best and most worthy in