

mark in his province—neither is the High or Public School teacher, as a rule, a man of mark in his locality. He may have an exceptional force of character, which cannot but be felt; but if his influence is felt, it is in spite of his position, not because of it. The cause of this state of things, wherein the presumed best educated men and women have the least influence, must now be sought. I have already suggested one reason, that is, the limitation of the teacher's work to purely intellectual teaching. But I wish to be more specific, and state that a very important cause is to be found in that rabid spirit of partyism which has grown up in this Canada of ours to the crushing out in a large measure of individual manliness—a spirit of partyism that has made it a crime against public opinion for a teacher to approach the margin of the political field. True it is that in some localities, favoured with an abnormal development of strength on the side of one party, an inspector or other favoured official may find his way into active politics and become, perchance, a useful henchman or heler of the predominate local political faction. This, however, is the exception that proves the rule. But it is not the unwritten law that closes the gates and erects barriers against the teacher in the domain of partisan politics that is objectionable. Few teachers, no matter how strong their political leanings, would care to lessen their influence with pupil and parent by plunging headlong into the seething and sometimes irrational excitement that characterizes our political warfare. His self-respect, his dignity, his truthfulness, his honesty might suffer did he allow himself to be dragged into the company and associations that are to be found in connection with a political contest. That is not what is contended for. On the other hand the intelligent teacher who has made

a study of past politics—that is history—and is at the same time an impartial and close observer of present politics, is, of all men, the best qualified to exert a wholesome influence on his pupils, and through them on future public opinion. Shall our teachers, you ask, preach politics in the school-room? To this I must answer, Yes and No. No, he must not preach party politics; he must not laud one political party, and denounce the other. He must not praise one politician, and treat with ridicule and contempt his opponent. He is not called upon to raise his voice for the old flag, or for annexation. These things and persons may have only a passing influence; they are not for the teacher and his work. Again, Yes, he should teach politics in the highest sense, if teaching politics comes in the way of his regular duties. By politics, I mean the duty of the citizen to the State—his relation to the State—its effect upon him, and his effect upon it. He should teach politics, as the best teachers of ancient Greece and Rome taught it; as the great men of England have taught and do teach it, not in the narrow sense implied by party warfare, but in the broad sense of what is best for the State and for the individual as an element of the State. That there is need for a practical reformation in our political life and its standards has already been stated, and it is the duty of the conscientious teacher to teach those precepts of truth, honesty, righteousness, that are the glory of a nation. There is a special need of such teaching in this land in which we live and take a deep interest. Our history has been one that has left us deeply affected by purely materialistic influence. The work of clearing forests, of building roads, erecting public buildings, digging canals, constructing railroads; all these things, and more, have fallen to our lot as the carvers out of a national