

kites," as Milton calls them, and which would leave upon a child's mind absolutely indelible impressions of the grandeur and growth of the destinies of our great empire. Taught thus, with the aid of geography (which is in itself a picture), history ought to be one of the most vivid and inspiring of subjects, and might directly conduce to civic morality. Moreover, if these pictures, on their first presentation, were definitely associated with their dates, the thirty or forty dates thus acquired would be retained easily and permanently, and would afford a useful scaffolding for the subsequent fuller study on the part of the older and abler pupils. But, in order that all this may not be spoiled by examinations, the Inspectors must be allowed to deal with this subject¹ as they are allowed (I am glad to say) in London to deal with the Bible, not exacting knowledge of minute details, but an intelligent appreciation of "the Story of the Empire."

Now, besides teaching history in such a way as to inspire patriotism, can we do anything further in our schools in the way of civic training? And for this purpose do we need a separate text-book, or may we trust to our oral comments on the history lesson? And if we need a new text-book, on what lines ought it to be written? And ought this book to include any hints or rules on private as well as public morality?

I think such a book would be useful, but it ought to be a manual rather than a catechism. Civic duties are, for boys, prospective duties; and a catechism of prospective duties is like a book of rules without exercises, apt to be learned mechanically, and worse than no book at all, because it takes away the appetite for knowledge. A civic catechism might tend to make boys slightly hypocritical, or, to put it briefly, prigs. But a civic manual would deal in facts—facts suggesting

precepts certainly, but not precepts themselves—and these facts might be made interesting as well as useful.

Take, for example, the subject of indiscriminate alms giving. A few words on this point might fairly find a place in a comment on the words of Scripture, "Give to every one that asketh thee;" but the evil is great enough to demand fuller treatment, and perhaps a short sketch of the evils that are known to have resulted from this habit in times past, together with an account of the working of the English poor law in this century might be made intelligible even to the young.

I think, also, that some explanation is needed of the rule that we are to do to others as we would wish that they should do to us. When a whining rascal puts forward this plea to escape well-merited punishment, it is not uncommon for kindly sentimentalists either to diminish the penalty or to feel uneasy and unchristian in inflicting it, whereas the true, and right, and Christian answer is this: "If I had done the mischief you have done, and if I knew what was best for me, I should know that I had deserved punishment, and should endeavour to bear it without complaining." In this connection a short but clear account should be given of the great virtues of justice and resentment (to be carefully distinguished from severity and vindictiveness) which have fallen into discredit of late with many worthy people, owing to an effeminate perversion of the letter of certain Christian precepts.

I recently read in the speech of some prominent politician that "the most laudable ambition" for a workman was to provide for the comfort and happiness of himself and his family. I should think that there was a misprint somewhere; but even if we substitute "a" for "the," we can hardly deny that "ambition" is a