

ing. The example of the youth of the neighbouring republic is not a happy one as regards social, filial, and moral relations. Yet it tends to infect the youth of this country with a spirit in which individualism takes the place of Duty—a spirit too apt to say to the proprieties and obligations of nonage, “let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their cords from us.” It may be said, that “the parents ought to see to the moral training of the children out of school hours.” But, as a matter of fact, is this done? No doubt, in every well regulated household, the most forcible of all moral lessons is given in the life of every day—the lesson of example from father and mother. But, over and above this, we are quite of opinion that some systematic training should be given in the theory of morals. It may further be said, that “there is the Sunday-school.” We believe the Sunday-school to be excellent in its way; it is the children’s share in the church’s service; the cheerful gathering of the little ones, boys and girls, bright in their Sabbath garniture, the pleasant half hour’s lesson in some Old Testament story or parable from the Gospels, the hymns, the library books, the not unfrequent pic-nic, all combine to make an impression never to be forgotten in after life. But all this does not meet the want of the time; it does not teach morality on a distinct system. Besides, we want a religious training that shall come not on one day, but every day; and not in one school, but in every school. The proposal to read the Bible as a text-book of morals seems to us not only expedient but most desirable, if, as a matter of justice (and the present School law provides for this), it be not objected to by any portion of the community who pay the School tax, and if it is likely to be so far agreed to by our Catholic fellow-citizens as not to be an obstruction to what we consider one of the most desirable of things, with reference to the future of our educational system—the amalgamation of the Separate with the Public Schools of the Province. As to the objection raised by many that Bible-reading will give rise to sectarian controversy, we reply that we have little fear of such danger.

The Bible will be studied from a moral rather than from a doctrinal standpoint, and the good sense of the teacher, we feel assured, can for the most part be relied upon to deal with what is easily understood as ethical teaching by precept or example, rather than with controversial questions, or what St. Paul calls “doubtful disputations.” We cannot, however, be blind to the fact that, in urging rigid compliance, on the part of the masters of all our Schools, with the existing regulations respecting the reading of Scripture, there are some difficulties and certain obvious dangers. But these need neither be magnified nor be made the subjects of contention; still less should they be stumbling-blocks in the path of Christian duty, on the part of a Christian nation, in a Christian land. Whatever the recent conference may bring about, there can be little question that some means should be adopted for more direct inculcation of the great principles of morality in our Public Schools.

“WHAT WILL HE DO ABOUT IT?”

THE Minister of Education, no doubt, has had his answer from the University Senate in regard to “Marmion.” We all know what was the Senate’s decision: it could not, with any degree of sanity, have taken Mr. Crooks’s, or rather the Archbishop’s, view of the matter; and it retains the poem on the curriculum for matriculation. Some weeks have now passed since the meeting of the Senate, and Mr. Crooks has not yet advised High School Masters that he removes his protest, and allows “Marmion” to be read. Why the delay? The poem has been on the University curriculum for the last three years, and the Minister surely had time to find out that it was “immoral” before authorizing its use for the current work of the schools. He had already ordered the book to be read; he knew that our publishing houses had prepared editions; that the text-book was in the hands of the pupils, and was in fact being taken up in the course. Having, under foolish interference, interrupted the study of the work,