

is needless to say how great is its power in forming the sentiments of children; far greater than that of moral precept. The teaching of "Sandford and Merton" was not very high, but the influence of the book was great. The teaching of Hans Andersen's tales is high, and their influence happily is great also.

Apart, however, from the instruction, the system and discipline of the school, if the system is good and the discipline well administered, are powerful instruments for the formation of character, especially the character of the citizen. They inculcate, at the most impressible age, and in the most effective manner, respect for authority and obedience to law. They form a daily training in order, punctuality, good behaviour, and regulated duty. In the case of the poor, even the material neatness and cleanliness of a good school, and its sanitary arrangements, are lessons in that which has been said to be next to godliness, and which is certainly very near to morality. More than this, it does not follow, because a school is not religious in its formal teaching, that it is not religious in its character. If the community to which the school belongs is religious, the religious spirit will pervade the school as it does everything else, as it does the social gathering or the place of business. No school-house door will shut it out. If Christianity is true, a Christian teacher will preach it, though not in the form of creeds and catechisms, yet in a more effective form by presenting to his pupils an example of Christian love of duty for its own sake, of Christian patience, gentleness, courtesy, forbearance, kindness to the infirmities of the weak. Before a word of the New Testament was written, and long before creeds or catechisms were composed, the Founder of Christianity taught his religion by his life.

It is only theology that we resign

to the parent and the clergyman, in whose hands we leave it with only a single remark; one which has a bearing on our discussions respecting the subjects of public education. Some people, especially those whom I may call political religionists, seem to think that though you do not believe a thing, or do not hold it as certain truth yourself, it may be a good thing to teach it as certain truth to the young. This is a Jesuitical policy, and surely, like all Jesuitism, it is a mistake. There are many things which must be withheld from the young; it would be wrong to disturb their minds prematurely with controversy or doubt; but surely it never can be right or wise to teach them anything but what you honestly believe yourself to be true. You defeat your own end; the child grows up, it hears what is said, reads what is written, thinks for itself, sees that a part of your teaching was false, mistrusts the whole, and becomes a general sceptic. Let us not forget that the Jesuits educated Voltaire. I say nothing of the effect of politic teaching of untruth on the teachers themselves. From the apparent conflict between science and religion, the religious world is at present in perplexity and distress; no one can help being aware of it; even an intelligent boy or girl, unless exceptionally secluded, must begin to be conscious of it. But our only hope of extrication lies in steadfast, single-minded and thorough-going loyalty to truth. The God whom we worship must be the God of truth, and the only way to Him must be the way of truth. Education is no exception. A child ought to be taught above all things that truth is sacred; and when he comes to look back upon his education he ought to feel that truth has been held sacred in his case.

There is one more clause in the deed of foundation calling for special notice, though I am not in a position