

text-books which it puts into the hands of its youth. An Australian colony, too, has not hesitated, in conformity with the secularistic principle which it has adopted, to excise from a passage of Longfellow the lines expressive of religious sentiment, before giving it a place in the book of lessons. The people of Manitoba, I feel sure, are not prepared for any such course in the matter of public school education. And in rejecting it—in regarding it with instinctive revulsion—they must be viewed as at the same time repudiating the purely secular view of the State and its functions on which it is based and of which it is the logical outcome.

So far, however, the conclusion is a purely negative one. Religious instruction in the public schools is not ruled out by the character of the State as a civil institution. But even if admissible, is it expedient? Is it requisite? The answer to this question, which is one of the very highest importance, can only come from a consideration of the end contemplated in public school education. What, then, is the aim of the State in instituting and maintaining public schools? There will probably be very general accord on this point. The aim surely is, or at least ought to be, to make good citizens, as far as education can be supposed to make such; citizens who, by their intelligence, their industry, their self-control, their respect for law, will tend to build up a strong and prosperous State; citizens whose instructed minds, whose trained powers, whose steadfast principles will serve to promote the public welfare. This, and neither more nor less, must be the aim of the public school in the view of the State, and as far as supported by it; not more—it overshoots the mark when it seeks to develop the purely spiritual qualities, the graces of a religious life, except as these are subservient to the origination and

growth of civic virtues, and not less; it falls as far short of the mark when it is viewed as designed simply to give instruction in reading, arithmetic and other such branches, and thereby to promote intelligence and to train intellect. The idea of the institution is most defective, so defective as to be virtually misleading, which makes the school simply a place for imparting knowledge, or, in addition, an intellectual gymnasium. It should be beyond question that the State, in undertaking the work of education, can only find an aim at once adequate and consistent in the preparation of the youth, so far as public education can prepare them, for the parts they have to play in civil life. In a single word, the aim of the public school is to make good citizens, or to train the youth of the State that they shall become good citizens. But to make good citizens the school must make good men. Character is at least as requisite as intelligence, virtuous habits as trained intellect, to the proper equipment for life. The prosperity, whether of the individual or of the State, rests on a treacherous basis, which does not rest on integrity and self-control. It is often the precursor of ruin. Against that ruin learning, whether of the school or of the college, is but a feeble barrier. Nay, learning divorced from morals, disciplined intellect disengaged from the control of virtuous principle may only make that ruin more speedy and more complete—may have no other result than to give us more skilful swindlers or more expert thieves. In this way, the school instructing the mind and cultivating the intellectual faculties while disregarding the moral nature, constitutes a real danger and may become a positive injury both to the individual and to society. In any case it must be obvious that the good man is necessary to constitute the good citizen, and the education therefore