

ceeding from the simple to the less simple by infinitesimal degrees. I have heard an institute put in an hour discussing whether $6 - 3 = 3$ or 3 from $6 = 3$ is the simpler form, and the arguments adduced would delight the scholastics of old, while one not of the elect thought "strange, such a difference there should be twixt tweedledum and tweedledee." The road to knowledge is no longer rocky and uneven. It is boulevarded in the highest style of the art. I remember listening for thirty minutes to an exercise with a class of young pupils. There was animation and interest. Pictures, objects and charts were liberally used. Not being clear as to the object of the exercise, I asked the teacher. She said: "I wished to develop the word 'man,' but, dear me, it will take another lesson." This brings to mind Dr. Stearns' story of the boy who was asked on his return from school: "What are you studying, Charley?" "Ain't studying anything," he said. "What! don't you learn anything at school?" "Oh, yes! learn what I allers knowed."

You find these exponents of a mistaken gospel of the new education in all schools. There is the teacher into whose room it is safe at all times to bring the average visitor. Her smile and manner are all the books prescribe. She is always beaming and lovable. She is never at a loss for some interesting point to bring before the class. There is a maximum of talk and minimum of study. The unsophisticated visitor comes away thinking what a pleasant teacher she is. Her class are so much interested in their work! How different from that stern Miss Sit-up-straight, in whose room there is no rest for the wicked and very little for the just! Yet when the principal goes round to grapple up the results of the year's work, Miss Sit-up-straight's class aver-

ages up in the 90's, while the pretty teacher explains away her 50's by showing the principal an article in her favourite school journal, showing that true culture and mental growth are not to be measured by per cent. These are the folly of examination cranks, and machine teachers. If the examination interferes with our theories, so much the worse for the examination. It must go. We rise superior to it, and teach so that the examiner gets nothing.

The mistakes are in these directions:

1. "There are few things so vicious as the attempt on the part of teachers to coax pupils' attention by supplying a perpetual fascination through devices or personal favour."

2. Instead of leading the child up to higher intellectual levels, the teacher comes down to amuse below the mental capacity of the pupil.

3. There is an over-elaboration of simple things, with illustrations too numerous and too babyish. We are not training to good mental habits when an exercise leaves a class in a state of hazy repletion.

4. Everything is brought ready made to the mind. There are no difficulties. It is goody on a spoon. Sugar candy teaching in the lower grades means dyspepsia in the upper,

These are the evil tendencies of the new education, they must be checked. It is most necessary, as Antisthenes says, to unlearn evils. Our reaction from a tyrannical system of teaching has made us forget that the end of teaching is not to place certain information in the mind of the pupil in the easiest way possible, but to attend to its retention and assimilation, and be sure that the process strengthens mind and character. If a pupil is not capable of walking alone, nothing he can have to show can rescue his school training from condemnation. The world of experience presents difficulties for