

thousands of such examples of the use of the Bible as a reference book in moral instruction on a religious basis ; or, at the least, on a broader and deeper foundation than individual opinion, or the average sentiment of the school room ?

But supposing some measure of sectarian difficulties to be imagined as possible, the case would not be exceptional. Such difficulties may and do arise to some extent in connection with other subjects, notably with history, literature and natural science. Protestant, Papist, Deist, Agnostic, Evolutionist—all can find many a chance to insinuate their opinions in connection with these subjects, either by their comments, explanations, or selections for reading. Yet no one thinks of excluding any of these subject from even the most religiously mixed schools—no, not even history, over which great contentions have sometimes arisen. If, then, these subjects can generally be peaceably and usefully retained in schools, the superlatively important subject of training in good moral character respecting self, fellow-man and society ought to be retained. Probably in nothing do the schools suit everybody. But that is no reason for abolishing them. It is thus far better that there should be sound and simple instruction in morals by precept, example and study, and such as nobody can reasonably find serious fault with, than that the schools should impart knowledge without wisdom also ; and train intellects without training character.

From all that has now been said, it appears that moral instruction is highly, nay, fundamentally necessary ; that it should naturally be more effective when given on an appropriate religious basis, than when placed on a merely secular one ; that it should be imparted largely through living object lessons in character, as seen in

the lives of teachers who, so far as man can be, are living models of what their pupils should be ; that it should also be imparted through systematic study, attractively appealing to intelligence, to the end that when the pupil is out of reach of protecting or persuasive personal influence, he may, of his own mind, know what is right and what is wrong, and why ; and so may, with wisdom of mind as well as warmth of feeling, choose the one and reject the other ; and that all this necessary, excellent and beneficially influential instruction can be given without admixture of sectarianism.

What, then, is the final conclusion in view of the beginning and progress of this discussion ? This : Prevention is better than cure. But if not by sagacious foresight, then it must be by regretful backsight upon a still further accumulation of embezzlements, frauds, wild speculations, corruptions and violent contentions, with accompanying disgraceful flights, murders, suicides and ruin of homes—all owing not to want of knowledge, but of character—that the lesson will at least be effectually learned that it is at least as important, and hence as much a right, that the state should protect itself against vice by teaching virtue, as that it should protect itself against ignorance by teaching the knowledge that enables one to earn his bread, and take care of his earnings : also that every child has an even better right to an education in the elements of good character—without which knowledge is possibly but a tool of mischief—than he has to any or all other learning, however precious it may be.

---

He who is original for the sake of originality is as much governed by the type from which he departs, as is another man who slavishly conforms to it.—*Phillips Brooks.*