

relaxed only for reasons as strong as those for which they were made. Nothing needless and vexatious either in the way of rules or interference. Gentle admonition when an offence is not wilful—reproof when necessary, but measured and appropriate to the offence. In the last resort punishment, not inflicted in anger, but so inflicted that the culprit shall fear to offend again. Such are the well-known and commonplace elements of a good discipline in schools or elsewhere. It is well to remember that reproof as well as punishment may be made ineffective, and worse than ineffective—it may be made the means of deadening a child's moral sensibility by indiscriminate use. If we would have a child mind what we say, we must let him see that we mind what we say ourselves. In children obedience itself is a virtue, and a habit which it is necessary to cultivate; yet so far as their understanding goes, it is well to let them know the reasons for the laws they obey, especially in a country where they are law-makers *in posse* themselves. They will thus see that punishment in case of breach of the law is necessary, and brought on them by their own act. Perhaps an hour or two in the course of each school year might be well employed in explaining to the school the reasons of the discipline they are under. A system of school discipline based on these obvious principles, and administered with steadiness, may produce a good and lasting effect on the character of our young democracy.

It is now an axiom that as much of kindness and even of affectionateness should be infused into the system as possible, and that the child should be allowed to feel as little difference as possible between school and home. Perhaps in many cases already, if the child feels a difference, it is not to the advantage of home. But still school, compared with home, must be a place of discipline; it cannot be all sweetness and picnics. Men in after life do not work for love of labour, but under the pressure of need; and I am afraid children will never learn their lessons entirely from love of learning. The idle will need the spur, and the unruly will need the rein. It will be well if spur and rein can be so applied as to improve the character instead of injuring it, as they did in the old flogging times.

Of the prize system, so much discussed, this perhaps may be said that, as the world now goes, competition is the law of after life, and competition at school may at least be fair, which that of after life is often far from being. But, on the other hand, there is truth in the objections urged in a poetic form by Cowper against the use of emulation as a stimulus.

'Boys once on fire with that contentious zeal  
Feel all the rage that female rivals feel;  
The prize of beauty in a woman's eyes  
Nor brighter loom in them the scholar's prize,  
The spirit of that competition burns  
With all varieties of ills by turns;  
Each vainly magnifies his own success,  
Resents his fellow's, wishes it were less,  
Exults in his miscarriage if he fail,  
Deems his reward too great if he prevail,  
And labours to surpass him day and night,  
Less for improvement than to tickle spite,  
The spur is powerful, and I grant its force;  
It pricks the genius forward in its course,  
Allows short time for play, and none for sloth,  
And felt alike by each, advances both;  
But judge when so much evil intervenes,  
The end, though plausible, not worth the means.'

On the whole, I would submit that the principle of rewards, given to all who come up to a certain standard, is better than that of prizes given by competition, and if the stimulus afforded by it is not equally powerful, I believe it is powerful enough.

I put the moral influence of the system before that of the character of the individual teacher, because I believe that in a general way more is to be hoped from system in all its departments than from the individual. The ideal teacher—the teacher who is painted in all essays on education, and whom school trustees and parents expect to get—may be defined as an archangel at five hundred dollars a year. But even the more attainable excellence, the excellence of the man who has a special genius for education, is as rare as any other kind of excellence. Among all the eminent and highly paid teachers I have known, I think I could count on the fingers of one hand those who had a special genius for their calling. There is no unlaying on ourselves, or on others, burdens of expectation and responsibility too heavy to be borne. We only discourage ourselves from doing that which is really within our power. The most that can be expected of an ordinary teacher is that a good system being given, he or she shall faithfully carry it into effect. For this it will suffice to have, in addition to common sense, diligence, punctuality, ordinary good temper, and ordinary self-control, without the magnetism and electricity which we are sometimes told it is almost criminal in a school teacher to be without, though magnet-

ism and electricity are not often found in parents or trustees. With the qualities I have named and a tolerable system, a teacher may be sure that he is improving the character as well as informing the minds of children, and doing a good work in both ways for the commonwealth, though he may not be a village Arnold. The very numbers would render it impossible for a public school teacher to be a moral missionary to each child.

The moral parts of the teaching are moral science, social science and history. Physical science has a moral aspect, as it impresses on us the necessity and duty of conformity to the physical laws of our being; but this idea, though its influence in the adult world is daily growing, hardly yet penetrates the mind of a child.

The modicum of moral science communicable to children is not perhaps yet very potent. A child knows what it is to be good; the great thing is to make him desire to be good. And this is to be done, not so much by analysing goodness for him as by presenting to him its image in a way to make it the object of his affection. This may be done either by history and biography or by fiction.

It is time that our school histories should be written on some definite principle, and with some definite object; for at present they are written for the most part without either. Yet their character is not without importance. I doubt whether a more active, or a more virulent poison was ever infused into the veins of a nation than that which is infused into the veins of the American nation by such school histories as are used in the United States. What can be expected if people are fed through their childhood on such stimulants of national vanity and malignity? But our common school histories, though not positively noxious like the American, are generally poor stuff. If they are not poison they are sawdust—dry epitomes with mechanical duties devoid alike of power and of nourishment. It would be almost better that children, instead of being thus repelled from the subject, should pick up their notions of history as they can. There may be said to be two elements in history, the philosophical and ethical. The philosophy of history is hardly yet in a condition to be presented to the young, but of the ethical part more might be made by simple and vivid descriptions of great characters and great events, such as would fix them in the imaginations and touch the heart. History thus taught would be no ineffective school of public virtue, especially of the love of our country, which is specially needed to correct the somewhat selfish and self-isolating tendencies of our race, and which we may cultivate in its good and moral side without running into the extravagance of Americans. Examples of private virtue will be furnished by biography, and I believe that well-written lives such as that model of biography 'Southey's Life of Nelson,' make a real and lasting impression on the minds of the young. I am almost afraid to speak of fiction. Charles Kingsley said the other day that he would as soon think of eating a dead dog as of reading a sensation novel. The amount of dead dogs people are daily eating is beginning to tell, depend upon it, on the mental habits of the eaters. But good tales are, and always have been, powerful instruments of moral education, both for children and for adults. I mean by a good tale not a *goody* tale, rewarding precocious virtue with plum-pudding, but those which present moral beauty in a winning way, and enlist the child's heart on the side of right. Few literary men have rendered greater service to this generation than Hans Andersen. I cannot help thinking that if instead of the dry reading to which children are condemned in reading books, it were possible to introduce a few good short tales, something might be done towards giving a right direction to their sympathies and tastes.

There is reason to hope that the day is approaching when Social and Economical Science will be made available for educational purposes in a way that will have a good effect on national character. I do not mean dry political economy, or the things that are discussed by Social Science Associations. I mean the great laws of our social and economical being. The one great lesson now taught our pupils from childhood upwards is to rise in life. It is not only the prize system that fosters this notion in our young citizens; it is instilled into them at every pore. To clamber over the heads of our fellows is the only way to respectability and happiness; to exist contented and do your duty in the station of life to which you are called is degradation and misery. Thus education, especially in the United States, becomes a preaching of universal discontent. Hardly a farmer's child there is willing to remain quietly on the farm. It would be injurious to the commonwealth as well as to the individual to check honest ambition, whether commercial or of any other kind. But the number of those who can really rise must be small. The great majority must, after all, look for their happiness in the sphere in which they are born. They must find their dignity and their comfort in their position as members of humanity, and as fellow-workers in a work the lowest part of which is as necessary as the highest, or rather in which there is no lowest or highest, but all the