

the highest realization of duty in the home and in the State. Then, while the Bible is a guide to life, life becomes a comment on the Bible; and although many questions will always remain dark and insoluble as long as evil exists, yet the soul will wait patiently for fuller light, and, meanwhile, accepting all the truth it can assimilate, will be strengthened in that love of God and man which is the only basis of true morality.

I pass to civic training. As the basis of morality is the love of our neighbour, and knowledge of its needs, so the basis of civic training must be love of the community and knowledge of its needs. It is obvious that history might be so taught as to stimulate the love of the State, and to increase the knowledge of its needs; but I fear that recently it has been in many schools scarcely taught at all. At least I can remember, two or three years ago, that a fairly intelligent boy from an elementary school, well trained in arithmetic and geography, told me that he did not know any history, and gave as his reason that "he had not learned it at school." And in the Education Blue Book of 1886-87 I find a chorus of complaints from Inspectors lamenting that, in consequence of some regulations of the Code, "history has died a natural death." I believe that subsequent changes in the Code have swept away these monstrously absurd regulations. If they have not, it is a mockery to speak to teachers about civic training. How can children do their duty to their country if they do not love it, and how can they love it if they know nothing about it? To neglect the study of our national traditions is surely to smoothen the path for national discord and disastrous revolution. If, as children, our pupils do not learn that time, and effort, and patience, and mutual forbearance between class and class, are needed to make and

develop a great country, are they likely, when they reach manhood, to resist the tempting belief that all grievances can be removed by statute, and that, in order to produce a perfect political constitution, we want nothing but ink and abundance of paper? The ideal condition is, that the study of national history should be a kind of domestic worship in which the fathers teach the children, so that, as the younger generation grows up, they can say with literal truth, "We have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them." But in modern times teachers mostly do this work for fathers. In any case, whether by fathers or by teachers, or by books or newspapers, the work must be done, if the rising generation is to receive anything worthy of the name of civic training.

Do we need new text-books in order to teach history in this way? Not so much new text-books, perhaps, as new examinations. Children ought to be examined in pictures, or in picturesque events, rather in a continuous stream of facts. Here is a picture of our country that was instructive to a great German writer:—"What the note of British freedom means," says Heyne, "I never really understood till the other day, when I saw an English vessel sailing past when it was blowing big guns, and listened to the crew on deck, whose voices rose above the roar of wind and wave, as with almost impious defiance they shouted the ancient strain of 'Rule Britannia, Britannia rules the waves.'" It would be easy to devise a score or two of pictures—word-pictures, if painted pictures cannot be had; but painted pictures, fit for a large lecture-room would be by far the best—which might take a child backward from the present time to the days of "the crows and the