

lished. They have done much to throw down sectarian barriers; to efface unreal distinctions; to promote true democracy, and to unite in a great brotherhood children of various nationalities and creeds. As the late Colonel Parker said:

"Home is the centre; the Church makes home better; but the common school is the place where the lessons gained in both may be essentially practised. Here classes learn to respect each other; children of the rich and the poor, the intelligent and the ignorant, are fused and blended by mutual action and mutual love. The common schools present a perfect means of moral training—order, work, and play—all tending to the cultivation of true manhood."

I am assuming that religion is the basis of morality, and that religious influences have in some way or other contributed to the moral status of every well-conducted person. I am also assuming that any attempt to base moral obligation on human authority alone weakens the conscience and enfeebles the will. With these assumptions, the teacher has a strong starting-point. The children that come to our Public Schools ordinarily have received in their homes, and in the Church, some preliminary training in religious beliefs. Generally, they will continue to receive instruction from the same sources. The teacher has, therefore, the essential incentives at hand for the highest type of moral training. The school cannot be called "godless," where the teacher's duties from a pedagogical point of view are faithfully performed. The Bible may be used in the school for moral ends, although not used in the technical sense of the term. If a teacher is well qualified, he will be acquainted with the Bible as the best work on ethics. He is concerned, however, not with theories, but with practical ethics. It is not necessary for him to discuss the ultimate basis of moral distinctions, in order to teach his pupils to be

obedient to their parents, to be honest and truthful, and to abstain from every kind of wrong-doing.

Religious sanctions are, however, sufficiently imperative for a teacher's purposes. Apart from the practical difficulties in the way of giving, through the teacher, religious instruction in the Public Schools, I hold that sound principles of teaching would condemn the methods of this kind which are frequently proposed. The fact is too often overlooked, that the question in dispute is one that should be discussed in the field of pedagogy, and not in that of theology or politics. Better moral training is certainly demanded in our schools. This object can be secured, not by more religious exercises, but by better teaching. Greater skill in taking up the branches already found in the curriculum will accomplish a great deal. If we have better qualified teachers, better discipline will be secured. The best teacher is the one who is the best disciplinarian. The good teacher does not need to give instruction in the common doctrines of religion, but to use religious sanctions as school incentives whenever they are warranted by the demands of sound discipline; indeed, a good teacher rarely brings to his aid the highest class of incentives. The parent does not find it prudent to use ordinary motives of a religious character in order to induce his children to do right. There is danger in associating religious influences too closely with the routine work of the school, or of the home.

"In view of these differences between religious instruction and secular instruction, and in view of the contrast between the spirit of the school and the spirit of the Church, it is clear that the school cannot successfully undertake religious instruction; in fact, experience goes to show that the school fails to achieve success when entrusted with religious instruction, and it is certain that the