

and remote, are beneficial, is good conduct; while conduct whose total results, immediate and remote, are injurious, is bad conduct." "According to popular acceptance, right and wrong are words scarcely applicable to actions with only bodily effects; but such actions must be classified under these heads as much as any other."

This school of writers therefore excludes from the school-room the teaching of obligations to one Supreme Being and his laws as the ultimate standard of right and wrong. The law of expediency is, apparently, their ultimate standard. But, as Miller in his work on School Management, says, "Any attempt to base moral obligation solely on human authority has always resulted in the weakening of the conscience and the enfeebling of the will." "No nation has ever achieved moral excellence that did not hold the Supreme Being as the final source of obligation."

In confirmation of this position, I need only call your attention to the abject and ruinous failure of the moral systems of Confucius and Buddha, whose theories some writers of sweetness and light would have us believe should be placed alongside the Christian Code, but which have given awful confirmation to the truth of Scripture that it is the fool who says in his heart "No God."

Another class of writers on educational topics teach directly or by clear implication that moral education, to be efficient, must involve the teaching of a final and infallible standard of right and wrong to which all are responsible.

Among these may be named Currie, Abbott, Northend, Page, Rosenkranz, Fitch, Hinsdale, White, Wickersham, F. W. Parker, Fowle, Baldwin, Miller.

The dicta of this school may be expressed in a quotation from our

Deputy-Minister's book: "The motives which flow from a belief in a personal God as the creator and moral ruler of the world; in the dependence of man on his Maker, and in his obligation to love and serve Him; in the immortality of the soul, and in the accountability of every intelligent person to the Supreme Being, are recognized principles of every efficient system of ethics."

Again, I agree that this is the true limit of the work to be assumed in training to citizenship in all Christian countries.

The writers of both schools are agreed that the teaching of morals is the subject of supreme importance for the well-being of the State. But there is a marked divergence as to the mode of teaching. Not a few of the best educators maintain that the direct inculcation of moral principles, as the principles of intellectual studies are inculcated, is a pedagogical error; and that all ethical instruction should be developed in the right teaching of secular studies and in the inculcation of order and compliance with the understood obligations of one to another, and of all to God. I quote Parker to show the theory maintained by him and others: "All teaching should be intrinsically moral, and all good books are text-books in morals. The demand for teaching morals as an isolated subject springs from the absence of moral effects in all other teaching." Again: "In developing motive we develop everything. Motive is the centre and everything comes to it." "The laws of action, or the principles of right doing, should grow out of the *doing* itself."

Others as strongly insist that not only should morals be taught indirectly in the instruction and government of the school, but also categorically, systematically, and from a comprehensive outline of common Christian belief, by the most competent in-