

mistake, and not a misprint, for "desire;" and some may think that "laudable" is a mistake for "natural." I think, in our Manual of Moral and Civic Training, some modernized version of the old fable of "The Belly and the other Members," should find a place; and it might be impressed even upon the youngest that if, in any community, it were regarded as "the most laudable ambition" in any individual to provide for himself and his family, such a community and such an individual would have an extremely useless, contemptible, and probably, in many cases, a short existence. Æsop's fable is reproduced, on a sublime scale, in St. Paul's Epistles; but St. Paul's Epistles are difficult reading for young boys; and, though the teacher will do well to bear in mind the Pauline version, the manual should reproduce Æsop's original.

Æsop's fable contains, perhaps, the earliest account of a "strike." The hands and mouth, if you remember, conspired with the other members to "strike" against the belly. Shall we point this out in our manual, or shall we avoid it as a "burning question?" I think we ought not to avoid it; but if we touch upon it we must be strictly impartial. On the one side we must show how our ancestors altogether suspected and prohibited competition, how they limited and hampered both labour and capital; how capital emancipated itself first; how labour then fought for, and gradually obtained, its rights, and how we have thus by degrees now come to a point where both are free, and both likely to ruin one another, unless they agree to submit their differences to arbitration—a conclusion which perhaps may be pointed by another Æsopian story which tells how the fox stole away the prey for which the lion and the tiger had been fighting till they had half-killed each other.

But questions that are really "burning," and unnecessary, or premature, must of course be avoided. Two or three years ago I opened what appeared to me a very good book upon civic duty, intended for the young, which told the children that we are "at present under a monarchy." Even if I were a red-hot Republican, I should still, as a teacher, think that this was an unpardonable mistake. Teach children, by all means—calling to your aid both fact and fable—that States, like trees, grow and develop, and that the best kind of political changes are those which imitate Nature, who "innovateth greatly, yet by degrees, so as scarce to be perceived;" but do not unsettle the minds of a small minority, do not utterly bewilder the vast majority of your pupils, by throwing out enigmas of this kind, which, if understood, would be regarded by many parents as a breach of good faith on the part of the teacher.

While we teach children that states grow, should we not teach them also how and why states decay? No doubt, something of this teaching can be given when one is explaining to children the meaning of the Fifth Commandment. Even the youngest can see that their days are not likely to be "long in the land" unless they give some heed to their parents; and older children can easily realize that this applies to countries as well as to individuals, and that reverence for elders, and for the traditions of elders, is one of the first guarantees for the permanence of a nation. But then we must add that other things besides irreverence destroy nations. Jobbery and corruption and all the other evils that spring up in trades, in professions, in church, in state, from the excessive and not always "laudable ambition to provide for the happiness and comfort of oneself and one's family"—these might be briefly but