

man to teach, and I am ready to go on, but I think we have done enough to justify us in saying that that clause among the clauses which give the instructions for carrying out a system of secular education, give it no claim to the name of religious education. I can only mention an argument made by some, that religion has no place in education, and should be left to the Sunday Schools. It is a theory, and one that is discredited among most thinking and practical people. In England it has been tried in places, and there is to-day a strong reaction. The work of teaching religion cannot be left to the one or two hours on Sunday by teachers generally without that training which no earnestness or zeal can dispense with. This is true even in the conditions of life in a well-ordered town parish, and how much more in our scattered districts, with the greater difficulty of gathering the children at any hour but that of Service with their parents, or of supplying teachers for them. The results speak for themselves. The fact to which I allude is that of the lamentable religious ignorance of not children only, but boys and girls in other things well instructed. Ignorance not merely of matters of faith or doctrine, but of the very simplest facts of Bible story.

I come now to the question, the very practical one, of what we can do. There are two lines of action possible: the first that of providing opportunities of distinct and definite Church teaching in Church schools for such as wish to avail themselves of it. I hope before long we may see our way to this, only I would add, it must be in a small way at first; and there is no possibility or likelihood of our being able in this way to do anything generally for the religious education for the children in our Diocese—it can only at least touch the few—and so I pass to the second line of action open to us, and that is to bring influence to bear to secure a real practical recognition of religion in the schools of the country. It cannot, of course, be one that takes any notice of the points of doctrine on which the religious world is divided, but it would be a decided gain to get the Bible taught, if merely as history, sacred history, and I believe the heads of the Presbyterian and Methodist bodies would agree with us in drawing up a syllabus of Scripture to be taught, and portions to be learnt. If we could agree on this I do not apprehend we should have any difficulty with the Board of Education. . . .

It is no vain thing—it is sad to think what the future of this country is to be if its children are to be brought up in ignorance of the Bible, which is not only the practical guide of life, but the foundation of the definite doctrines which are taught in our Creed. It was said by a historian of the Anglo-Saxon race in one of the ages when the