

or one hour in the week is sufficient for religious training when nearly the whole week is needed for the acquirement of secular knowledge? And to speak of the efficiency of home training in religion is sheer nonsense and random talk. "Religion is not a garment to be donned and doffed at will. It is rather something to be so woven into the warp and woof of thought and conduct and character—into one's very life—that it becomes a second nature and the guiding principle of all one's actions. Religion cannot become all this to the man if it has been banished during the school hours of the boy."*

The "spirit of the age," that extreme opinion of the might and right of the civil power over individual interests is the subtle enemy of all our institutions, civil, social and religious. Modern opinion says that the state has rights in the matter of popular education. We concede that it has, *some* rights at least, but we deny it the privilege of abusing these rights. Secularists say that it is the duty of the state to provide education, but as the state has nothing whatever to do with religion, it cannot prescribe the teaching of religion in its schools. To us it seems the whole difficulty lies in understanding in what education consists, and what kind of being man is. To say that education is merely a system of instruction whereby man's intellectual faculties are developed, and a certain amount of worldly knowledge is imparted, is to call by the name of education what is only a very incomplete education, a part, and the inferior part of true education. Such an opinion is born of the materialistic thinking of the age, that looks upon man as an animal of a refined nature, differing from brutes in the possession of intelligence only. This is materialism pure and simple, and entirely false. Man is indeed an animal, gifted with in-

tellectual faculties, but more than that, endowed with an immortal soul, enjoying free will, and responsible for all his acts to a divine law-giver, his Creator. Possessing an intellect and a will, man's education is not limited to the development and training of one only, but of both. A system that is intended to develop the one and disregard the other is necessarily false, and the education so imparted is consequently incomplete. And this is precisely what secularists demand.

The state undertakes the responsibility of controlling education and providing it for its members, with the view of making them good citizens. But a man, no matter how learned, whose moral education has been neglected, whose will is left untrained, cannot be a good citizen. The state, even to realize its own intentions, must therefore provide a complete education, it must afford the means for the training of both the intellect and the will, of the brain and the heart, and as religion alone is efficacious for the latter, religious training must be provided for. The whole man must be educated, not a part only. It may be retorted: Then the state must teach religion! Not at all, no more than it teaches anything else. It merely provides for worldly knowledge, and must make provision for the religious as well, and it is not the business of the state whether pupils will profit by it or not. How many refuse the advantages of even secular knowledge?

We well understand and readily recognize that the teaching of religion in the national schools brings us face to face with a great difficulty, on account of the various beliefs that children hold, or more correctly, that their parents desire them to hold. But admitting, as we must, that there is a duty, a grave obligation, of providing the means for a religious education, the presence of a difficulty for a fulfilment satisfactory to all, does not liberate the state from that duty. And surely the

*Brother Azarias at the N. Y. State Teachers' Association.