

fogy or a young fogy. It's fogyism anyway. Just as surely as the self-respect of the teacher goes down, the nation's respect for education and intellectual life is going down with it. When we become no longer their guide but their drudge, woe unto the nation we strive to guide! But most important of all, what is the outcome to them of this Jewish system? Does it not tend to bring out all that is selfish and small and bartering? All that is money-loving? If they are so mercenary with regard to educational matters, they will be equally mercenary with regard to other things, and the children we are training amid such surroundings will grow up more mercenary still. To be sure, they will build fine houses, have fine furniture, perhaps fine school-houses. But they will not pay for the unseen things. Education and culture are too ethereal for their minds. If they must pay out money, they will pay it out for things they can see and taste and handle, not for the unseen, the everlasting things of life. They will spend five thousand dollars on a barn, but they will not spend one thousand on the education of the son who is to manage the farm, because they can't just see what they are getting back in dollars and cents for it. But, ah! Is this the nation we love—our dear Canada—drifting on this muddy stream of materialism, amid brick walls and factory smoke, instead of afloat on the broad ocean, with God's blue sky above? Instead of the land of genius and of saints, a materialistic, money-loving nation! Why, if this thing goes on for a few generations, we'll have people paying their minister with a few bags of turnips, and billeting the teacher around among the poorest of his section, because the poor soul will not have fit clothes to appear among the wealthiest of his employers.

But of what use to murmur? It is not an hour for complaint, but for

action. One of our most brilliant ministers pronounces our system of engaging teachers as "rotten." The word, if disgusting, is expressive. *It is rotten*—a mushroom! a fungus! Then, why, in this era of change and reform, don't we alter it?

There are at least two very important causes for this state of affairs. In the first place, there is an impression among many of the fathers of our country that, when they have gone to the expense of paying their daughters' board in town while they attend High School, they must make teachers of them to get back the money spent. Again, their materialism comes to the front. They do not see the use of an education unless they can make something by it. Culture is a myth to them. Of course, there are many cases where people are too poor to afford an education without doing something afterward to replace the expense. But why must they teach? There are countless other occupations. Why, for example, should a young lady with a first-class certificate consider it throwing her education away to be a nurse, dressmaker, milliner, stenographer, etc.? Why should not an education fit one all the better for such spheres? What we need is better educated tradespeople. Why, then, should this one profession be tumbled full of a lot of people, many of whom are no more adapted for the guiding and training of children than so many kittens, but who have got there simply because they have gone through a course of High School study? Then there is a cry of too many teachers—a woefully false cry! There are not too many, but too few. Too few earnest, enthusiastic men and women thoroughly in love with their profession. The real fact is, anybody can be what we call a teacher if they have an education. Our county Model School is a place of universal salvation. There were fifteen plucked last year, to be sure, but it was only