

ways been in connection, not with the rule, but with the motive; it has always been, not to point out the direction in which the life should move, but to cause it to take this direction, in spite of the deflecting force at work. The failure of Pagan systems of morality was far more due to defective sanctions, than to wrong rules of conduct, and the vice and crime which are found in every Christian country to-day are in only a small degree the result of ignorance of what is right. They are mainly due to sinful dispositions, some of them inherited, to unbridled appetites, and to the force of bad example. Now the problem is, to find and to bring into play a motive or a cluster of motives powerful enough to overcome these forces of evil, and to carry the life in spite of them towards what is good. In the absence of religion, with that sphere closed, where is the public school to find such a motive? Denied access to those which religion supplies, by what considerations is it to enforce obedience to the moral rules which it lays down? There are, of course, considerations of expediency, of self-respect, of the authority of the teacher, and the fear in extreme cases of the rod which he wields, to which appeal can be made, but who would expect noble and generous character or action as the result? It is undeniable that the highest and most powerful motives of right conduct lie within the religious sphere. Even if it does not require the idea of God to render the conception of duty intelligible—to ground it—as many think it does, it is certain that the being and character and moral government of God give to the word duty a new force, and invest the whole details of duty with a new sacredness, presenting them as the embodiment of the Creator's will. It is not less certain, that added hatefulness and terror gather round falsehood, selfishness, injustice, all that is undutiful and wrong, when it is viewed as the object of His displeasure "in Whom we live and move and have our being;" while a whole circle of moral excellencies, patience, meekness, gentleness, considerate regard for others, self-denial, do not so much gain added charms, as they almost come first into distinct sight, when they are enjoined in the words and displayed in the life of the Saviour of mankind. There may be a select few—persons of philosophical thought, who can dispense with these sanctions of morality or who think they can; whose observance of duty rests on some other grounds, but to the great bulk of mankind, and very specially to children, they furnish the strongest and most appreciable motives to virtuous action—they are the indispensable supports of right conduct. To me, therefore, it is as certain as any moral truth can be that to shut out religion from the public school, and thus to refuse to the teacher the employment of these sanctions, is to render the moral teaching

weak and ineffective and therefore to defeat the very end which alone justifies the State in maintaining the school, the training of good citizens, or at the very least, to make the attainment of that end far less complete than it might be. Even Huxley says "My belief is that no human being and that no society composed of human beings ever did or ever will come to much unless their conduct was governed and guided by the love of an ethical idea, viz., religion. Undoubtedly your gutter child may be converted by mere intellectual drill into the 'subtlet of all the beasts of the field,' but we know what has become of the original of that description and there is no need to increase the number."

THE NECESSITY OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH

to effective moral teaching would be admitted by some, not by all, of the advocates of a purely secular system of public education. It would be more or less fully admitted by most of them who are professedly Christian men. But the ground is taken, that while the knowledge of religious truth is desirable, even indispensable, it is best, especially in the divided state of opinion on religious questions, that religious instruction should be communicated by the parent and by the Church, and that the school should confine itself to instruction in the secular branches. This is plausible; it is no more. I believe the position to be essentially unsound. For, first, if moral teaching, enforced by religious considerations, is requisite in order to make good, law-abiding citizens, that is, in order to promote the security and the well-being of society, the State ought to be able itself to furnish it, and ought to furnish it in the schools which it maintains. It is not denied for a moment, that there is a kind and amount of religious instruction which is more competent to the parent and to the Church, that there are aspects of religious truth, as for example, the nature and the necessity of regeneration, the work of the Holy Spirit, with which perhaps these alone should be expected to deal, but the more general truths of religion, as the existence, the character and the moral government of God—such truths as, we have seen, add to the sanctions of virtue and strengthen the sense of duty—these it must be competent for the State to teach, otherwise it does not possess the means for its own preservation and for the protection of its own well-being. Second, the restriction of the school to purely secular instruction with the relegation of religious instruction and even moral on its religious side, to the home and the Church gives no security that the latter will be supplied at all in many cases. There are not a few parents, even in our favored land, who are too indifferent to impart moral and religious teaching to their children, not a few whose own character and habits render them quite incapable of effectively