

the result of the "faster" rate of living of recent times,—that the objectionable characteristics which obtrude themselves so frequently are only surface blemishes which will disappear as the years of discretion are reached, and that in course of time the benefits contemplated by the Legislature as the results of the Education Acts will be attained.

It may be answered that the allegations are founded upon a very intimate and practical acquaintance with the subject. Whatever the ultimate effects of the Education Acts may be, there is unfortunately too much reason in the present day to fear that the "surface blemishes" will develop into qualities that are more likely to increase than to lessen the number of habitual offenders. They certainly point very strongly to serious defects in the present mode of teaching the young. Can this mode of teaching and the subjects taught be so arranged as to bring about a material improvement in the conduct of the rising generation? Can such improvement be so developed as to produce a lasting effect on character and conduct, and therefore to be reckoned on as an important factor in reducing the number of habitual offenders?

It has long been known that many of the best teachers in the employment of the School Board have formed very decided opinions as to the non-moral effect of the present system of teaching. Of course they do not suggest for a moment that there is the slightest immorality in it; but they are very pronounced as to its non-moral tendency. They complain that their time is so much taken up with "cramming" in order that the Government grants may be secured, that it is impossible for them to devote themselves adequately to such moral training of the children as should form one of the chief essentials of their lives.

If, instead of the "cramming" that has been going on for the last three-and-twenty years, there had been a healthy "standard" of conduct steadily taught to the children, the results would have been very different, and we would not be deploring the increase of juvenile delinquency and the other unsatisfactory characteristics of the children of to-day. If half as much attention had been given towards teaching the young to be truthful, thoughtful and useful, kind and civil, courteous and polite, cleanly and orderly, as there has been given to "cramming," we venture to think that the outlook as regards our habitual offenders would not be so dismal as that which unfortunately prevails. If every child on beginning its school career was properly grounded in rules of good conduct, not only while attending school but when at home or on the street, a foundation would soon be laid on which would rise the improved behavior of our young men and women. If such a curriculum had been established when the School Boards were originally formed, and had been persistently and intelligently taught, we would at the present day have been having such restraining home influences as would have ten times more effect on the growth of the habitual offender than all the improvements that can ever be introduced in their police court or prison treatment, or in the amendment of the liquor laws.

It may be said that the duty of teaching children good conduct is one which more properly belongs to the parents than to the teachers, but until the parents themselves know something more about good conduct and behaviour, and how to live properly, it is idle to expect them to teach their children. Under the present "cramming" system neither the children nor the parents of successive generations can be much improved, and we will