

Royal Household Flour

But is it so? Is this the kind of economy that

is wise and profitable? Is it doing our full

We wouldn't think of buying the lowest priced eggs in the market just for the sake of economy. We would feel that because they were cheap they would be good eggs to avoid. The low price would give us a suspicion of their freshness and quality.

duty to our loved ones?

But when it comes to flour, for example, we may be tempted to buy the second best instead of the best because of the few pennies difference in price. We may think that economy in flour is different from economy in eggs. But it isn't. The principle is the same. The difference in cost between the best flour in the

world and ordinary flour is so little that in justice to our responsibility as wives and mothers we can not afford to take clances.

From every point of view Royal Household Flour is more economical than any other. It produces more loaves to the barrel. It is richest in food value. It is more uniform. It is best for Pastry as well as Bread and vields more baked product in either bread or pastry than any other flour.

ROYAL HOUSEHOLD FLOUR furnishes more nourishment, more real food value per pound and per penny's worth than any other flour in the word.

Ogilvie's "Book for a Cook' win be sent free to the weman who asks name of her dealer.

Ogilvie Flour Mills Co. Limited.





THOROUGHNESS





Against Loss of Tone, and tone is the most important factor in any piano. In every Gourlay Piano the expert knowledge of its builders and the determination to use NOTHING BUT THE BEST either in labor or material, produces a sympathetic richness of tone that is unmatchable among Canadian pianos.

WRITE FOR CATALOGUE AND PRICES

Gourlay, Winter & Leeming

188 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ont.

the present. I like when a youngster comes to a word he does not know when the teacher says, "spell it," and not have him "gagging" and trying to get the sound without. And I think, also, there are not enough national songs introduced, nor enough patriotism nor love of their country instilled into the minds of our children when young. Also, agriculture should be taught, and plots secured for demonstration. It is all very well to teach history away back from the times of Agricola, but it ought to be taught briefly. Children ought also to be taught something of the old lands where many of their parents came from, but ought to be taught more of their own land, and their surroundings. Instead of doing such fiddling things as making things with paper and pasteboard, they ought to know about "seeds," and how they germinate; "plants," and how they grow, and all about domestic animals and their habits; also birds, butterflies, beetles, and grubs, etc., and everything going on around them. I wonder how many know, when a horse goes to lie down, which end goes down first, and which end comes up first, and a cow, ditto; or how many legs a caterpillar has got. Such things ought to be of more interest than Napoleon crossing the Alps. A teacher asked me only last spring, "What do you call those trees with the smooth bark? meaning the beeches. "What do you call those cattle with the white faces?" "What like is a groundhog?" and such like questions, and when I asked her, "Of what composition does a snail make its shell?" she could not tell me. What is the use of a teacher like that in a country school? And she was one with a "certificate."

Nature study ought to be one of the principal studies, with illustrations and demonstrations. When a child is taught to love nature and understand it, there is not much fear for it. It brings it in touch with Nature's God. How much better would such studies be than accounts of bloody battles that took place hundreds of year's ago. There is no such thing as "War and Glory." The war may be, but not the glory. In olden times, men were not much better than savages, and children's minds ought to be pointed forward instead of back. All such pictures as "Inkerman" and "Balaklava," and the "Thin Red Line," should be eliminated from our schools and homes, and in their places something quiet and restful should be put.

The schools themselves need nearly all to be remade. All the old schools have the light coming in from the side. I saw a school latery that had nearly all the windows in the front, so that when the children faced the teacher, the light came over their shoulders. Then, our schools are not cleaned often enough. Which housekeeper amongst us would be satisfied to houseclean twice a year, with only an occasional sweep-up between? And how many amongst us would be satisfied with and help her do her best work. bare walls and bare floors? Why cannot a few strips of matting be got, and a few rugs to lay down around the front; some nice plants for the windows? And dren are studying, why cannot the mothers, yes, and fathers, go and visit the school and the teacher once in a while, and encourage her, instead of listening to tales that are too often carried home, of what So-and-so did, but how their own little angel was all right, and never did anything? The parents should speak respectfully of the teacher, even if they do not consider her a good one, and instill into the minds of the children, "respect for their elders," for that is one thing that is sadly lacking in the children of the present.

Grey Co., Ont.

Two Topics.

Dear Dame Durden.-When your request came for me to write on "What our schools most need to improve them?" the first thought was, I am not in touch with the schools, and cannot pass an opinion on that subject. There has been, and is now, so much written and published in the papers about our school system, its advantages and defects, that it is puzzling. But something has happened to set me thinking. We have a four-roomed school. Two of the teachers left in June, one to be married, the other to go on the city staff. So we had two new teachers when school opened, but one had to resign at the end of September

and they had to advertise for another. One of the trustees called one morning and told me they had several applications, but some would not do at all. Drawing a bunch of letters from his pocket, he handed me one, and said, What do you think of this?" I read the letter. The writing was in the style that a child of 10 or 12 might write, the spelling bad, the language very ungrammatical. So I think that one requisite for the schools would be to have teachers that could write, spell, and compose properly.

I have been surprised and shocked at the poor way the young folks read nowadays. What I think is needed is to have the children taught to read distinctly, and express the author's meaning. Where one has the gift of singing, twenty could read, if this art were cultivated.

Your second question, "How to amuse children on wet days." I had to think what I did for my children, and what I did when I was a child. One of the pleasant pictures of memory is an arbor in our old English garden, where we kept store and made mud pies, cups and saucers, and other things on half-holidays, for it was the custom then to have Wednesday and Saturday afternoons for half-holidays. There was a place near where we got the clay, and worked it until it was like putty, so that we could fashion it into what we wanted.

One of the pleasures of my own children was to play store and make money out of cardboard to represent cents, five and ten cents. This would amuse them a whole afternoon. Then they were very fond of dressing like grownups, and having a tea party with their little dishes I knew a lady who mixed flower and water into a stiff dough so that it would not stick, and this would amuse her three stirring boys and keep them quiet making things on a wet day. Hoping these few hints may help some busy mother.

HELPONABIT.

York Co., Ont.

"Our Schools Really Need Intelligent Parents.'

Years ago, I used to think what our schools-particularly the one I attendedmost needed to improve them, was a race of angelic teachers; later, I thought it the children who lacked angelic qualities, and later still, I came to the conclusion it was my own individual comfort I was thinking about in both instances.

Our school system is a good one. It is not perfect; but, like a good Christian, is improving all the time, and is plenty good enough now to work on.

The course of stady might he made a shade more practical; no doubt it will be. Teachers usually do their part well, but what I think our schools really need, are parents, intelligent parents, who understand their responsibility, and are willing to co-operate with the teacher

I think one is safe in saying that the majority of parents know little-and if the child's school reports are fairly satistro loss_about what their chil-No matter how conscientious a teacher may be, her work will fall far short of what it should be, if the pupil sees that her efforts are not backed up by the parents.

The inquiry, "Johnnie, have you studied your lessons?" may be made; perhaps not even that much interest taken; but the chances are that the knowledge of what Johnnie should be learning is of the most vague character.

I do not advocate parents trying to keep pace with their children in all their studies. We do sometimes read of wonderful women who studied Latin while washing dishes. No doubt one of the two suffered, and most likely it was the dishes; but I do think it is possible, and, indeed, necessary, that parents should "keep track," so to speak, of the child's

There has been a great deal, of late years, in the papers and magazines about "overstudy," "too much school work at home," etc., etc., and the teachers, and school boards and council, and various other persons, were blamed, and all the time ninety-nine per cent. of the fault could have been laid at the door of the

Who has the child's greatest good at heart? Whose duty is it to watch over the health of the child? Who has so good a chance to understand its constitution and what it can stand as have the