

**'ROUND TABLE TALKS.**

A few years ago the editor thought of an expedient to bring the readers of the REVIEW in closer touch with each other, and the result was a series of "Round Table Talks." The design was not to answer puzzles or solve mathematical problems, although many thought it was, but to devote a page or so which teachers should regard as their own, where the more experienced could aid those who had little experience, by helping to solve difficulties and giving devices and methods which they had found to work successfully in their schools.

Earlier still in the history of the REVIEW a successful teacher and administrator conducted a series of "Talks with Teachers," which dealt with the everyday difficulties with a great deal of judgment and tact.

But neither of these plans has been entirely successful or has realized the object which we had in view.

Nearly three hundred names of new subscribers have been added to our lists in the past three months. The majority of these have never taught school before. We wish to make the REVIEW helpful to them, not by solving questions which they ought, with a little industry, application and scholarship, to solve for themselves, nor by filling the columns of the REVIEW with a series of "lesson-helps," but by giving them the benefit of the experience of those wiser in teaching than themselves. Let the young and inexperienced teachers present their difficulties in the "Round Table Talks," and we ask those who have met and solved the same difficulties to assist us in making this page in future the most interesting in the REVIEW. We want our own educational problems dealt with by earnest question and answer. It is admitted that teachers are not paid sufficient salaries. On the other hand it is contended that some are paid more than they are worth. This is no doubt true. What is the remedy? The inefficient teacher must be stimulated and encouraged to do better work.

For more than seventeen years the REVIEW has striven to improve the condition of our teachers. It has been aided by strong helpers in our colleges, common schools and private schools. But we want others, equally strong teachers, who can make the REVIEW a greater power for good and a greater strength to teachers than it has been before.

**Canadian History as She is Taught.**

By W. C. MURRAY.

There is a small book in the "School Helps Series," prepared by two prominent Ontario teachers, which presents in brief form Canadian history as it is taught to young Ontario. This little book has travelled beyond the narrow confines of that province.

It is a curious production. It is called "Canadian History Notes." Previous to 1867 the history of this fair land of ours covered the events which happened on a narrow strip of land on the shore of lake Ontario, and a few of those on the St. Lawrence.

It is a wonderful book. From it the young Ontarian will learn that a place named "Port Royal—now Annapolis, N. S.,"—was founded in 1604; that many of the loyalists "went to England, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick," and ten thousand of them became the founders of Upper Canada; that confederation included, with others, two provinces, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; that the B. N. A. Act "was bitterly opposed by the people of Nova Scotia," and that there was a Halifax commission. Beyond these extensive and exhaustive statements he will learn nothing about the oldest English-speaking provinces in the Dominion. The booklet contains sixty-four pages.

Will it be very marvellous if the young product of the much lauded school system of Ontario comes to believe that Ontario is Canada and Toronto the centre of—well, all that is worth knowing?

What impressions of arbitration do you suppose the young lad will get when he reads that the Alabama "claims were referred to an arbitration which met at Geneva in 1872. The Americans greatly exaggerated their claims, and of the \$15,500,000 which England had to pay, several millions are still unclaimed and in the hands of the American government?" (This occurs in a book of outlines, from which opinions are usually excluded). Is this exactly true? If it be a fact, is it wise to parade it? Does it not imply that the five men of the commission representing England, United States, Switzerland, Italy and Brazil were either stupid, or hopelessly prejudiced, or dishonest? Might it not be as well for the young Canadian to be left unprejudiced against arbitration, or at least to hear all the facts? A little dispraise of war is not injurious.